THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS MYRA B. MARTIN
HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. IX. JULY, 1934 No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

ESSAYS

Othello the Man ..... *Elmer Edgar Stoll* 111

The Folio Text of "Troilus and Cressida" ..... *S. A. Tannenbaum* 125

Dramatic Reminders ..... *George F. Reynolds* 145

Lord Cobham and Shakespeare's Duchess of Gloucester ..... *Marion A. Taylor* 150

EDITORIAL NOTES 157

COMMUNICATIONS

Tarquin's 'Ravishing Slides' ..... *Thomas W. Hastings* 161

Twin-Voice of Shakespeare ..... *Carl J. Weber* 162

TREASURER'S REPORT 164

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 808 West End Avenue, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 808 West End Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1934, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

A scene from 'Troilus and Cressida'

(From J. Tonson's edition of the play, 1734, by courtesy of Mr. L. M. Thompson.)

Othello The Man

By ELMER EDGAR STOLL

OTHELLO THE MAN is my subject, not Othello as the central and inseparable component of a great dramatic structure and as a figure on the stage. With the latter I have dealt elsewhere,[1] and have shown that he was led to hearken to Iago, not with a psychological justification, but by means of a time-honored convention, and in order to precipitate a more highly effective situation, that of a hero, by nature not jealous but noble and lovable, becoming jealous nevertheless. To further this end he is made neither stupid, on the one hand, nor pliable, on the other; and neither suspicious, nor (what comes to the same thing) improperly trustful; for if he were either, he would fall short of our full sympathy and weaken the situation. By the convention Iago's hypocrisy is presumed to be impenetrable: by Shakespeare's handling of the convention it is so indeed. Cassio and even Desdemona, as well as the hero, turn to the villain for counsel; the villain, truly sagacious, plays the part of honesty convincingly: and therefore the hero himself is not a fool or gull. He is, on the contrary, one of the most tragic figures ever put upon the stage,—

> An honourable murderer, if you will,
> For nought I did in hate, but all in honour.

How, then, can he convince or content us today, thus lacking in a predisposition, a psychology? Still, as of old, by his character, by trait and speech; and not only by the individuality of the one and the identity of the other but by the poignant charm of both. Like the ancient dramatists, the other Elizabethans, and more of the moderns than we care to acknowledge, indeed like artists generally, Shakespeare appealed, not primarily to the intellect and reason of the audience, but to their eyes and ears, their imaginations and emotions; and, like them, he drew immediately perceptible characters, did not work up psychological studies. Poetry, with its infinite differentiating power, is his chief resource; as line and color, not anatomy, nor geology and botany, for that matter, are the chief resource of the painter. Art, as Wordsworth says, deals with appearances. The dramatist provided motives, and considered mental processes, often but in so far as was necessary for a stage presentation, even as a sculptor carves only the front of a figure designed for a niche. And for the purposes of the play as a whole, for the intensity of the central situation, he sometimes found it necessary, as here, not to provide or consider further. He must simplify and condense the big volume of matter his situation embraces. He must model in high relief. By the critics, to be

[1] Most fully in my *Art and Artifice in Shakespeare* (1933), chapter ii.

sure, the hero's internal mechanism, thus omitted or obscured, has, like Hamlet's, Macbeth's, and Lear's, been supplied; and with a serious irresponsibility, charming or irritating, according to their natures, as if each were the dramatist himself. Or rather, as if they were novelists, analyzing, in the early chapters, after the nineteenth-century style. How much better to do what was expected of us,—watch the dramatic performance before us, marking the traits as they appear in the moving picture, hearkening to the speech, with its tones and overtones! There, unmistakably, are the characters—in a work, not of science, but of art.

It is in Scene 2 that the Moor first comes before us. Iago has been telling him how out of loyalty he had felt like yerking Othello's enemy, Brabantio (or, possibly, Roderigo), "here under the ribs": " 'Tis better as it is," is the reply. Nothing could be simpler or, in itself, more commonplace; such a speech who of us could not have written, and why attach to it any importance now? Many of the greatest strokes of art are nothing in themselves, but, like this, significant only in their place or at the moment; and here at once is heard Othello's voice, and in his vein,—his tolerant calm and dignity, which, save in Iago's clutches, eclipsed by an alien passion, appears throughout. Even when thus obscured his native temper is discernible; and though not in original brightness, it fully emerges before the end. By no coincidence Othello's last words to Iago, as he vows himself in Titanic pride to eternal silence, are an echo of these:

> Well, thou dost best.

That is not merely a repeated *motif,* or a rest-tone at the close of the harmony, but also what Othello, as we have known him, must certainly have said. Even then he can give the devil his due.

All that now follows gives Othello's first speech the effect of harmony and propriety; what precedes gives it that of relief or force. Iago has been telling of the animosity and abusiveness of his enemy, and with our own eyes we have already seen the General's informant contriving against him. The Moor and his love are in danger, and it is thus that he takes the news! The effect is heightened as this limb of Satan endeavors to work upon him. "Nay, but he prated," and Iago holds out the prospect of divorce or imprisonment; "Let him do his spite," says the Moor. If anybody could have written the hero's first commonplace words, not everybody could have made them so momentous; and those that presently ensue nobody else could even have written, still less have put in their place. Hitherto Othello's character has been

appearing, as if in Ibsen, by way of realistic every-day conversation, but presently it appears in poetry, and then his voice takes on tone and resonance. It passes, as it were, from speech to song. But he is speaking still, in character and to the point. Unlike Hamlet, he has few idiosyncrasies or pet expressions, is not addicted to questions or parentheses, repetitions or colloquialisms. He is no such restless, impatient, moody or startling spirit; and his dignity, serenity, and amplitude of nature become manifest in a fuller, more circuitous and weighty utterance (the parentheses, if any, flowing, not zig-zaging like Hamlet's), and in a more gracious deference or condescension of address, than is to be found in Shakespeare's other heroes.

for know, Iago . . .
Good Signior, you shall more command with years
Than with your weapons.
Most potent, grave, and reverend signiors,
My very noble and approv'd good masters . . .

He has leisure and inclination to speak the name, often with title and attribute, of the person before him,—"Desdemona", "Cassio", "Iago", "sweet Desdemona", "honest Iago", "O my fair warrior", "Nay, stare not, masters"; and with the Senate, the Doge, and Brabantio his ceremoniousness is heightened. In general he has an easy approach:

Yet, *by your gracious patience,*
I will a round unvarnish'd tale deliver . . .

I do beseech you,
Send for the lady to the Sagittary.

Come, let us to the castle.

Why, why is this?
Think'st thou I'd make a life of jealousy?

. . . Had it pleas'd Heaven
To try me with affliction; had they rain'd
All kinds of sores and shames on my bare head,
Steep'd me in poverty to the very lips . . .

Why, anything.
An honourable murderer, *if you will* . . .
Well, thou dost best.
Soft you; a word before you go.

But though easy, his tread is stately:

She lov'd me for the dangers I had pass'd,
And I lov'd her that she did pity them.

Then must you speak
Of one that lov'd not wisely but too well;
Of one not easily jealous, but, being wrought,
Perplex'd in the extreme.

And he seldom, and never sharply, turns aside:

> Wherein of antres vast and deserts idle,
> Rough quarries, rocks, and hills whose heads touch heaven,
> It was my hint to speak—*such was the process,*—
> And of the Cannibals . . .

In short, he is not high-strung and mutable like Hamlet, abrupt and impetuous like Macbeth, violent like Lear, testy like Coriolanus; and if Hamlet's voice is vibrant and penetrating, Othello's is resonant and full.

All this, however, has to do only with the manner or etiquette, the gait or vesture, of the spirit which we know and love; and this last is disclosed at once, betraying traits and qualities in abundance.

> . . . for know, Iago,
> But that I love the gentle Desdemona,
> I would not my unhousèd free condition
> Put into circumscription and confine
> For the sea's worth.

Here already are the richness and the volume of his voice; here are both the tenderness and the manliness of his spirit; and the measure of both the magnitude and the sanity of his affection is the adventurous freedom which he has half reluctantly surrendered for it. He is no Oriental voluptuary, "brought up in a harem," and no black infatuated with a white. Indeed, there is no more of the Moor or negro in him than of the Italian in Desdemona. And he has neither the obsequiousness, nor the resentment, and still less the sense of inferiority, of a subject race. On the contrary, though devoted to Venice, he is proud of his royal lineage and untouched by shame for the stigma of his color. Of a racial psychology or a pathology[2] there are no traces in him; such notions, indeed, are fairly foreign to Elizabethan dramatic art; what is African or Oriental about him is merely a matter of sentiment and poetry, of adventures in faraway places and of imagery drawn from nature and from battle; and for all the stalwart vigor of his manhood he is as romantic a character as his young and gentle wife.

A party with torches appears, and Iago, declaring it to be Brabantio and his friends, artfully begs him to retire. "Not I; I must be found"; but it turns out to be Cassio and the messengers of the Duke, whom Othello then receives

---

2 This notion of *Kulturgeschichte* and *Völkerpsychologie* in Shakespeare, which, so far as Othello is concerned, seems to have been started by Schlegel, but was long since knocked on the head by Bradley, still comes to life now and then, as in Dr. Aronstein's review of my *Art and Artifice, Anglia-Beiblatt,* 45, p. 100 f. Iago makes capital out of Othello's colour and age; but it is only under his spell that the Moor considers either matter, and then only for a moment. "Haply for I am black . . . and for I am declin'd into the vale of years—yet that's not much"; and he never refers to the matter again.

with his sincere and ample courtesy. Presently comes Brabantio indeed, and with officers and weapons; on both sides the parties draw; and thereupon we perceive the source of his calm and dignity, a courage so great as to be cool, a self-possession too lofty to be troubled:

> Keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them.

He was born, evidently, to command; but this is much the same sort of pleasantry that later appears in the Senate Chamber, as he undertakes to tell

> what drugs, what charms,
> What conjurations and what mighty magic,
> (For such proceeding I am charg'd withal)
> I won his daughter;

and as he ends:

> This only is the witchcraft I have us'd.
> Here comes the lady; let her witness it.

It is not wit, with point or edge; that is to be found in Hamlet: it is the ease and liberty of a mind equal to whatever befalls. In the happy fulness of his being, his words break into a ripple in the face of danger; but the voice is the same as when he is touched. How naturally, how instantly and graciously he now subsides in deference to the Magnifico, his father-in-law:

> Good Signior, you shall more command with years
> Than with your weapons.

And, on the later occasion, who but he would so begin his defence before the Senate, the tale of his whole course of love, after Brabantio's abusive interruption and the question (about poisoning the young maid's mind) put by the Senator squarely at him:—

> Her father lov'd me; oft invited me . . .

If he does not smile a little, though sadly, at the contrast of his own quiet words with those he has been hearing, it is because courtesy forbids him.

But we are anticipating. The Moor's deference at the first encounter calls forth only reproaches, which end in the old man's order to lay hold upon him. Othello again bids them stay:

> Both you of my inclining and the rest.
> Were it my cue to fight, I should have known it
> Without a prompter.

He is every inch a general; and his tone of authority, as it should, now rises; but, still quietly and conciliatingly, he informs the Magnifico of the Duke's summons to the Council, which they answer then together.

In the Council Chamber Othello is toward Brabantio deferential and reticent still, noticing none of his personalities, and replying only to the charge

before the Court. "What, in your own part," asks the Duke, "can you say to this?" "Nothing," puts in Brabantio, "but this is so"; and thus the Moor's first words before them,

> Most potent, grave, and reverend signiors,

ring out with only a clearer dignity. This native inclination is now stimulated by the oratorical occasion, and its effect is enhanced by his own depreciation of his powers.

Again there is a contrast with Brabantio's indecorum, as, at Othello's words, "I won his daughter," he breaks out, amid his griefs, like one talking to himself:

> A maiden never bold;
> Of spirit so still and quiet that her motion
> Blush'd at herself; and she, in spite of nature . . .

And that is not only such psychology as both the dramatist employs and audiences can appreciate, but is also dramatic art.

The daughter is a subject still tenderer to the lover, and, as he takes up the tale, the verse—his voice—is respondent to it;

> And, till she come, as truly as to heaven
> I do confess the vices of my blood,
> So justly to your grave ears I'll present
> How I did thrive in this fair lady's love,
> And she in mine.

How much of the frank tenderness of the final phrase would be lost to us under another metrical arrangement, and without the pause before it! How much would be lost in prose! And how delicately and indirectly he puts the matter, as he intimates, in their common defence, that she, in her simplicity, had met him half way! When she was wooing, he was thriving.

Then comes the famous story of this reciprocal courting, too long and too familiar to quote. Some critics have taken it not so much seriously as grimly, and have found Othello rather too romantic to be a responsible and steady-going husband—a prey to fancy and sentiment and a gull already. Like Desdemona, like Romeo and Juliet, he has not learned the facts of life, as everybody now does or should; they all do not know, as now every welfare-worker or heart-to-heart columnist does, that interracial or runaway marriages, prompted by pity or love at first sight, are liable to failure! Shakespeare himself does not know it, in his plays. The critics do not go so far as Iago, who charges the Moor with bragging and telling fantastical lies; and yet they knit their brows. The men "whose heads do grow beneath their shoulders",

however, come straight out of Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana* (1596), and were in those days accepted; and if any flaw in Othello's metal appears in his story, the dramatist himself takes pains to conceal it. "I think this tale would win my daughter too," says the Duke. Save Iago (and Brabantio at this moment) everybody in the Senate—everybody in the play, whether in Venice or in Cyprus afterward—is filled with admiration for the Moor and impressed by his reputation. Here again the dramatist is dealing in stuff of the imagination and the emotions; and to hint at such defects in the hero would be, like giving him a jealous predisposition from the outset, to throw the advantage of the convention, or initial premise, away.

With Doge and Senate the Moor has won his case if not with the critics; and now, when the cause of the summons is put before him, he begs, though newly wedded, no exemption or indulgence. "You must away tonight."

Des. Tonight, my lord?
Duke This night.
Othello With all my heart.

His wedding-night! If anything could prove him sound and solid from skin to core, without Oriental voluptuousness, erotic absorption or infirmity, it is this, together with what he has already said to Iago about his unhoused free condition; and the dramatist's work upon him in this Act has been swiftly and surely done. He is clearly not what Raleigh calls him, "a man carried off his feet, wave-drenched by the passion of love";[3] and not only our sympathy but our admiration is wholly engaged.

One of the many causes for Shakespeare's success in his artistic endeavour, both in this play and in others, both in his own time and afterwards, is the way his two chief means of characterization—directly in the house and indirectly on the stage—confirm and support each other. Here folk are of one accord in thinking the Moor noble and lovable, valiant and capable. "Another of his fathom they have none," Iago admits at the outset; "for he was great of heart," says Cassio at the close. And the effect is not incommensurate with the cause. We in the audience are of the same mind, as we hear him speak and see him move. It is not merely because the other characters agree—that they do also concerning Iago's honesty—but because we have ears and eyes

[3] That, like the unsuspiciousness that suspects, is really jealousy; though this Sir Walter (whom I always honor) has just denied him. (*cf.* p. 197). These are the psychological paradoxes dear to the critics, in place of Shakespeare's dramatic contrasts.—I wonder that Othello's martial readiness to postpone his wedding-night has not been turned into "a fear of his own love", like Macbeth's "fear of his own courage." What a morbid tribe, these Elizabethans; for most of such critics take these characters for "documents!" Many even presume to name the original, by preference an Earl.

of our own. We find no reason to demur as we often do at a play by Ibsen or O'Neill, who cannot endow the characters with the nobility or beauty which has been attributed to them.[4] The "noble Moor" does not disappoint us, nor the "gentle Desdemona", nor "honest" Iago either—have we not heard him betimes in soliloquy?—as we turn from the reflection to the figure. Sometimes in drama there are effects to be secured by a contrast between these, but, save by confession to the audience, not in Shakespeare.

In a brief essay it is impossible to follow the character throughout the play; and elsewhere I have shown how skilfully Shakespeare has contrived to approach and lead up to the in itself improbable complication of a generous hero causelessly in a jealous rage. In every way he is the "noble Moor", "whom passion could not shake," but by Iago's arts he is shaken; that, by Shakespeare's arts in making the improbable probable, is his tragedy, more moving than any psychology on the stage could be. Yet there is preparation enough for the crisis, though external rather than internal. Even in Act I Iago's honesty and sagacity are insisted upon; and it is he and his wife who are given charge of Desdemona. Brabantio warns the General against his wife's deception: Iago counts upon it. On his arrival Othello enjoys such happiness that he fears Fate can have no more of it in store for him; and he who by reputation cannot get angry, comes pretty near to it when there is an uproar on the watch, and in his inquiry thereupon (though Cassio, to be sure, makes no defence, and Iago is impenetrably honest") shows scarcely a judicial spirit. Indeed it is only as we keep the attitude of a Renaissance audience (accustomed to story, not psychology, on the stage, and to the convention of the calumniator credited) that we do not take the hero to be really a little gullible as he succumbs in the Temptation Scene. The convention, the dramatist rightly thinks, must not too plainly appear.

Also, what is more to our present purpose, I have elsewhere indicated how skilfully and effectively Othello, in the state of jealous and vindictive rage, is kept, though of course not consistent, continually recognizable. By his manner and bearing we are ever reminded of his old self—"And she in mine."

> For she had eyes, and chose me.
>
> No, not much mov'd,
> I do not think but Desdemona's honest.

[4] *Cf.* my *Poets and Playwrights* (1930) pp. 125-6.—A Swedish professor of English has misapprehended these, like most of my other, words. He takes me severely to task for objecting to the Norwegian and the Irish-American dramatists because their heroines are not *handsome,* like movie stars. *Anglia-Beiblatt,* 43, p. 372. Hedda and Rebecca are not charming, as Lövborg and Borkman, *teste* Brandes, are not the geniuses they are made out to be.

Poetically—imaginatively and rhythmically—he is still identical. The "Pontic Sea", "the error of the moon, which comes more nearer earth than she was wont and makes men mad", "aspics' tongues", the Sibyl "in her prophetic fury", "one entire and perfect chrysolite", these are not out of keeping with "some nine moons wasted", "antres vast and deserts idle," and "hills whose heads touch heaven." And what more fitting as a climax to his full-throated utterance and ample movement than the almost epical simile of the Pontic and the farewell to "content" which antiphonally answers the foreboding of his "content so absolute" upon arrival at Cyprus? In poetry, indeed, the Moor, like all the nobler characters of Shakespeare and those of the ancients before them, has his authentic being. Like Macbeth, and Lear, and Hamlet, but unlike a character of Pinero or Galsworthy, he will not "abide our question"—these last are nothing if they won't.

What is more directly dramatic, in speeches almost as convincingly Othello's own, his love is ever before him, is not, as in the naturally jealous, converted and distorted into hate; and this of itself produces glorious effects upon the stage.

> If she be false, O, then, heaven mocks itself!
> I'll not believe't;
>
> Villain, be sure thou prove my love a whore,
> Be sure of it!
>
> Nay, that's certain. But yet the pity of it, Iago! O Iago,
> the pity of it, Iago!
>
> Come, swear it, damn thyself,
> Lest, being like one of heaven, the devils themselves
> Should fear to seize thee!
>
> O thou weed,
> Who art so lovely fair and smell'st so sweet
> That the sense aches at thee, would thou hadst ne'er been born!
>
> One more, one more!
> Be thus when thou art dead, and I will kill thee
> And love thee after.

And what is as important to our sympathy, not only has he manifestly not bred the gross and bestial, selfish and egoistic passion within his own black bosom, but he does not nourish and cherish it, as the jealous do, before our eyes. The sensual images and promptings are Iago's; and Othello, for the most part, only responds to these. By this unpsychological contrivance of the convention he has not the soul of a sensualist amid his tragic agony, and he can be really "an honorable murderer" (if the *critics* will) before the end. In his own right he is impelled, not by carnal and vindictive desire, but by a

notion of duty; and he is swayed by love. At this point there are both the convention of credulity and a now extinct notion of conjugal rights to accept; in Shakespeare's hands he kills her, still her lover, as her judge. And here at the climax, as in the rôle ever since he falls into his Ancient's toils, is that "balance or reconcilement of opposite or discordant qualities" essential to drama. What, however, most contributes to the acceptableness of the situation is the power of poetry, the unmistakable ring of Othello's voice, the throb or quiver of his passion.

> It is the cause', it is the cause', my soul'—
> Let' me not` name' it to you, you' chaste` stars'!—
> It is the cause. Yet I'll not shed her blood,
> Nor scar that whiter skin of hers than snow
> And smooth as monumental alabaster.
> Yet' she must die', else' she'll` betray' more` men'.

What a tone and a gesture for the apostrophe to the stars; what changes at "Yet I'll not shed her blood," where we are buoyed up as in consolation, and at "Yet she must dies," where the metre snaps!

The scene begins solemnly, well-nigh religiously; but when the lady wakes, it becomes, though more terrible, rather more appealing to our realistic taste. Justice comes nearer to breaking her sword: the innocent tears of the lady only steel it. "Have you prav'd tonight, Desdemona"; and we are reminded of what he had said of her, not many hours (or minutes) before, in the scene where he plays the visitor at a brothel:

> And yet she'll kneel and pray: I have seen her do't—

a memory still more natural and more poignant at its reappearance. And the pangs and throes of affection are more perceptible in what follows:

> Well, do it and be brief; I will walk by;
> I would not kill thy unprepared spirit,
> No, heaven forfend! I would not kill thy soul.

(The final syllables are heavy with all the weight of his purpose on his heart.) Still more perceptible are they after the deed:

> What noise' is this'? not' dead'? not yet' quite` dead'?

(If the Moor were jealous by nature and not merely laboring under a strong delusion this clash of feeling would touch us less.) And again:

> Ha, no more moving?
> Still as the grave. Shall she [Emilia] come in? Were't good?
> I think she stirs again:—no. What's best to do?
> If she come in, she'll sure speak to my wife.
> My wife! my wife! what wife? I have no wife.

There, in the last line, is one of the full and sudden flashes of the Shakespearian

tragic lantern, which illumine and project the scene, which make the stage wide as the earth and narrow the action to an instant. In the latter part of the play they abound:

> What committed!
> Heaven stops the nose at it, and the moon winks . . .
> Methinks it should be now a huge eclipse
> Of sun and moon, and that th' affrighted globe
> Did yawn at alteration . . .
> ask thy husband else.
> O, I were damn'd beneath all depth in hell
> But that I did proceed upon just grounds
> To this extremity;
> Be thus when thou art dead, and I will kill thee
> And love thee after.
> Cold, cold, my girl,
> Even like thy chastity.

The last two outcries are like Lear's:

> No, no, no life!
> Why should a dog, a horse, a rat, have life,
> And thou no breath at all?

and Macbeth's:

> Wake *Duncan* with thy knocking! I would thou couldst!

In Ibsen's dialogue there is more of penetration and suspense; in Shakespeare's more of seizure and comprehension.[5]

Again Emilia, whom he has already answered, cries out within, and now he goes:

> I had forgot thee. O, come, Emilia.
> Soft; by and by.—Let me the curtains draw.—
> Where art thou?

Here is more psychology of the right dramatic sort, in this stage-business; and at the word "wife" he *had* forgotten. There has been, in his own words, an "eclipse", and he is now groping and stumbling in its shadow.

The *finale* of *Othello* is, I think, the most imposing in any tragedy save *King Lear;* but the great stroke is where the hero so manifestly, so spectacularly comes from under the spell of his delusion, and is almost, but not quite, himself again. All along he has been Othello, though under the baleful shadow

[5] This concentrating vision, which often links the hero's feelings with those of the universe—as in the case of the "huge eclipse" and "the affrighted globe" in the present scene,—is, like the comment of subordinate characters upon the hero and the poetic presentation of the hero himself (see above p. 1), part of the Shakespearian and the ancient dramatic system of the emotions, which I have discussed more fully in other articles, particularly one on the "Dramatic Texture" to appear in the *Criterion,* and one on "Reconciliation in Tragedy," to appear in the *Toronto Quarterly.* Since writing this, I have come upon "L'Esprit Elizabéthain" of M. Edmond Jaloux (*Cahiers du Sud,* no. 154, 1933) where, though more finely, are expressed somewhat similar opinions.

of Iago; now he shines forth, in wonted though troubled splendor. And the spectacle moves to music. I have elsewhere[6] traced an effect of rhythm and recurrence, not at this point only, but also as, with dramatic suspense and mystery, thoughts of the sword, of the past and the future, come and go, or rise and fall, by a sort of undulation, in the hero's consciousness. All I can touch on here is the effect as his full voice, which has been, as it were, disguised, or dramatized, peals out again at intervals, amid the varied tragic action, but carrying another, a covert burden of woe. But this is music not only for the mind but for the ear, and we listen for it:

> Nay, stare not, masters; it is true indeed.
> Are there no stones in heaven
> But what serve for the thunder?
> I am not valiant, neither,
> But every puny whipster gets my sword.
> But why should honour outlive honesty?
> Let it go all.
> I have another weapon in this chamber;
> It is a sword of Spain, the ice-brook's temper,—
> O here it is. Uncle, I must come forth.
> . . . . . .
> Look in upon me, then, and speak with me,
> Or naked [unarmed] as I am, I will assault thee.
> Behold, I have a weapon;
> A better never did itself sustain
> Upon a soldier's thigh. I have seen the day
> That, with this little arm and this good sword,
> I have made my way through more impediments
> Than twenty times your stop. But, O vain boast!
> Who can control his fate? 'tis not so now.
> Be not afraid, though you do see me weapon'd . . .
> Soft you; a word or two before you go . . .

In the final speech, which with these last words begins, he looks forward, through the past. He remembers his services to the signiory, as in reassuring Iago at the outset, and his deeds of prowess, as in the tale of his wooing; and, as when near the end it will, the past possesses him. His utterance is more deeply tinged with Oriental memories and imagery; but it is like Othello directly, in mood, tone, and rhythm. He speaks pregnantly, weightily, masterfully, though not serenely, as of old. Even now, a prisoner, he declares himself, not as in the presence of the Senate, but as one clothed in authority, "Speak of me as I am—Then must you speak—Set you down this—And say besides, that in Aleppo once." So, above, "I must come forth—Look in upon me . . . or . . . I will assault thee." He is Othello still.

[6] See my *Art and Artifice in Shakespeare*, pp. 43-47.

He says nothing now of Desdemona, of his love or despair; all that sufficiently and terribly appears at the end. Mr. Eliot is of the opinion that Othello has, for the moment, forgotten her, and is turning himself into a pathetic figure; he remains a tragic one. "Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate." What could be manlier? Here there is only the finest possible use of the Elizabethan convention of self-description, which serves to keep the character's qualities immediately before us. He thinks of one thing and speaks of another, speaks of himself and thinks of her; and what can be more dramatic? Moreover, he must now at last think a little well of himself, even because he has thought so ill of himself; and what can be more tragic? Tragedy deals with both the extremities and the limitations of human feeling; and it is chiefly as we arrive at the latter that we know we have passed through the former. Several times already, in the musical but dramatic movement in his mind, touched upon above, and in the passages cited, this endeavor to think better of himself has appeared. He is not only a lover but a soldier, a governor,—

> But why should honour outlive honesty?
> *Let it go all.*

What a groan of surrender,—in his case, honour *would*.

> For nought I did in hate, but all in honour.

That high and tragic but improbable situation has in the play been comprehended and realized, in both speech and action. What is more remarkable, the hero also has been realized, as a man. By consonance of traits, not consistency of motives, by poetry, not analysis or inner disclosure, by word and figure, by accent and rhythm, this great thing has come about. The dramatist keeps to the medium he has chosen, as a painter does to line and color, the sculptor to masses and surfaces: he keeps away from science—from psychology—and to his art. And it is by virtue of the imagination at its highest potency, not of the intellect, that the improbable becomes probable, even at the intellect's expense.

What is almost equally important to the illusion, the hero belongs to the world in which he is presented, a romantic, poetic world. It is far away, at Venice or Cyprus, if really there. Certain solid, hardheaded considerations do not apply. He does not see through Iago, for others do not; he is thereby not a gull, for the others are not. And no more than Desdemona does he come to grief in his love-making through want of a solid and extensive knowledge of the other's character; for nobody in the play or any other of Shakespeare's takes that point of view. The Moor's travels and exploits have been marvels,

and his tale of them has won Desdemona's love. Brabantio thinks he has won it, not by "undue influence," but spells and medicines. This is a court where such charges may be entertained, for the Senator inquires of the Moor if the Magnifico's report be true.

> Or came it by request and such fair question
> As soul to soul affordeth?

The language itself is not of the tribunal! And the handkerchief that she loses is not such as women are daily, though innocently, losing, but has magic in the web of it, which Desdemona believes. The motives are those of romance, and the atmosphere is that of poetry. Othello and Desdemona are enveloped in auras, as is Iago also, though his is somewhat electric and murky. One and all they are human. But their thoughts are images, their passions make harmonies, their words are notes of music; and like Hamlet and Ophelia, Macbeth and his Lady, Lear and Cordelia, Antony and Cleopatra, as well as the characters of all great drama, epic, and novel, they belong to their own world, not unlike ours, yet remote, transformed.

University of Minnesota.

A Critique of the Text of "Troilus and Cressida"

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

PART II
THE FOLIO TEXT

THE Folio text of *Troilus and Cressida* presents no less interesting and no less difficult problems than the Quarto text (Q). Generally speaking, editors[1] seem to think that the Folio text (F) is, on the whole, "slightly preferable" to the earlier text. Whether this is because F had better editing, or because Heminge and Condell had the author's original manuscript, they do not say. Sidney Lee thought that the editors of the Folio printed their text from a different manuscript than the one to which the Quarto publishers had access. Clark and Wright[2] were of the opinion that, whereas Q "was printed from a transcript of the author's original manuscript," F was printed from the same manuscript but after it had undergone revision and "slight" alteration at the author's hand and subsequently "been tampered with by another hand." Mr. Peter Alexander recently expressed the view that "The copy for the 1623 version . . . consisted of a Quarto text corrected from a manuscript in the possession of Heminge and Condell."[3] Sir Edmund Chambers thinks[4] that F was set up from a copy of Q but "The example of Q used must . . . have been corrected from a manuscript," and "the manuscript used for F was probably the author's original." He goes on to say (*op. cit.*, 441) that "one cannot be sure from the texts alone that either [Q or F] rests on stage-copy." In striking contrast with this view stands the opinion of Professor Hardin Craig: "When the Folio was printed the text used was a different one from that of the Quarto of 1609, probably the playhouse manuscript in possession of the King's Company."[5] A re-examination of the evidence upon which these conflicting views are based is therefore not only warranted but called for.

As in the case of Q,[6] we may begin by saying that the text we are now investigating cannot be the work of a shorthand reporter. It is much too good for that. There are no errors which can certainly be attributed to mishearing, or which cannot more probably be explained as the results of thoughtlessness or misreadings. A reporter could not have caught or preserved so

[1] *Cf.* J. S. P. Tatlock's edition of the play in the "Tudor Shakespeare," p. ix.
[2] See William A. Wright's "Cambridge Shakespeare," 1895, volume 6, page x.
[3] "*Troilus and Cressida*, 1609," in *The Library*, Dec., 1928, p. 269.
[4] *William Shakespeare*, 1930, I, 439 and 440.
[5] *Shakespeare: A Historical and Critical Study*, 1931, p. 703.
[6] See pages 55-56 of the April BULLETIN.

many metrical elisions and contractions as characterize the version of this play in the Folio.

From the occurrence of a large number of suggestive identities of various kinds, it may reasonably be inferred that Q and F were to some extent based upon a common source. These identities concern unusual spellings, incorrect punctuation, unnecessarily hyphenated words, omitted hyphens, extraordinary misprints, incorrect verse-lining, omitted stage-directions, wrong assignment of speeches, identical textual corruptions, and certain remarkable contractions.

Orthographic identities of an unusual kind are the following: *woe* (for "woo"), *yet* ("you"), *lieue* ("lief"), *maruel's* ("marvellous"), *teachy* ("tetchy"), *refracturie* ("refractory"), *chipochia, staule* ("stail"), *Ideot* ("Idiot"), *Cemitar* ("scimitar"), *lo* ("a"), *wreake* ("reck"), *lowe* ("lo!") *heroycall* ("heroical"), *twoo'd* ("'twould), *morall, seale* ("zeal"), *chuse, toague, brasen* ("brazen"), *Dooes* ("Does"), *too't* ("to't"), *tenure* ("tenor"), etc. Here, too, we may perhaps most appropriately mention the following orthographic peculiarities common to Q and F: *a field* ("afield"), *a foote* ("afoote"), *a weary* ("aweary"), *a maine* ("amain), and *whose* for "who's".

Among identical contractions we shall mention only these: *offring, a'th* (for "o'th' ", though F has *a'th'*), *wandring, own's* ("own is"), *medcinable, mappry, though't, deerst, lottry, watry, encountring, sequestring, mockry, T'invite, Beckning,* and *reverb'rate.*

Equally significant are the identities in the omission of *e* before *d* and *st* to indicate the loss of a syllable for metrical reasons, *e.g., unpractis'd, fair'st, couch'd, indrench'd, tel'st, lai'st, gor'd, fin'st,* and *starv'd.* (All these occur in the first scene of the play.)

In view of the frequency with which *'d* and *'st* contractions occur throughout the play, the comparatively rare instances in which both Q and F fail to indicate such contractions (in verses requiring them) is of great significance. As examples of this we may mention *winnowed* (III. ii, 179), *vnbrideled* (III. ii, 132), *vnbodied* (I. iii, 16), *pitied* (I. iii, 157), *married* (III. iii, 110), *declined* (IV. v, 189), *stichied* (F=*stythied,* IV. v, 255), *moved* (V. ii, 32), *withered* (V. ii, 42), *blowest* (IV. v, 11), and *owest* (V. vi, 7).

The failure on the part of both Q and F to indicate required contractions other than *'d* and *'st* at identical points may, of course, mean that F was

printed from Q, or that both had a common origin.[7] Such erroneously uncontracted words, few in number, are the following: *dangerous* (II. ii, 64), *cormorant* (II. ii, 6), *venemous* (IV. ii, 12), *generall* (IV. ii, 70), *laboring* (IV. iv, 38), *amorous* (IV. v, 282), *reuerend* (IV. v, 204), and *murtherers* (V. x, 4).

Other significant errors in Q and F in failing to indicate elisions for metrical reasons are *you are* (for *"y'are,"* at IV. ii, 40) and *the appauled* (for "th' appalled," at IV. v, 4).

The occurrence in Q and F of identical unnecessary elisions and contractions in prose passages is perhaps even of greater significance in connection with what we are discussing. Such things cannot possibly be accidental coincidences; they must indicate commonness of origin. We shall mention only such of these abbreviations as are unusual and striking, as, for example, *broke's* (for "broke his," IV. ii, 79), *That's to't* (III. i, 31), *ath's* (F=*o'th's, i.e.,* of these), *Th'other's . . . to't* (I. ii, 89), *pluck't* (I. ii, 175, Q and F=***pluckt***), and *take't* (I. ii, 221). There are many others.

Pandarus, praising Antenor, says (I. ii, 202), according to Q and F, "he has a shrow'd [*sic*] wit." This typographical coincidence is one of the three main pillars in the structure reared by Mr. Alexander in his essay in *The Library.*

In the matter of the use of hyphens in compound words, or what looked like compound words, Elizabethan and Jacobean printers, like the scribes of those days, were extremely erratic. Apparently, they knew no law in the matter. It is therefore significant if we find the compositors of Q and F inserting hyphens in certain words where they might have been omitted and omitting them where they might have been inserted. A few of these is all we have room for here. We find in both our texts *vnder-takings, be-sotted, Out-liuing, vp-lifted, butter-flies, maiden-heads, bug-beare, forth-with, out-stretcht, with-hold, Black-berry, dumb-discoursive, out-swell, well-fam'd* and *fore-head.* On the other hand, the expected hyphen is wanting in the following words and compounds: *after dinners* (II. iii, 119), *thrice worthy* (II. iii, 199), *great siz'd* (III. iii, 147), *momentary swift* (IV. ii, 14, F=*momentary, swift*), *double hen'd* (V. vii, 11), *broker, lacky* (V. x, 33), and *humble Bee* (V. x, 43). And, no doubt, there are a few others.

[7] It is obvious, of course, that these principles or generalizations apply only to books in which elisions and other sorts of contractions are so numerous as to betoken nearness to a careful author's manuscript.

An absolutely certain indication of an intimate bond of relationship between Q and F is the occurrence of certain misreadings common to both. These are not numerous but significant. They are as follows: *sets* for "set'st"[8] (V. ii, 139), *smile* for "smite"[8] (V. x, 7), *exclaim* for "exclaims"[9] (V. iii, 91), *lyte* for "tight"[8] (I. ii, 9), *goe* for "give"[10] (III. iii, 178), *to field* for "to th' field"[9] (I. i, 5), *will* for "wit"[11] (I. ii, 90), *scorne* for "storm" (I. i, 39), *presume* for "presume't"[12] (III. ii, 171), *possession* for "possessions"[9] (III. iii, 5), *loue* for "come"[13] (III. iii, 4), *flames* for "flame"[9] (III. ii, 172), *Comming* for "Cunning"[14] (III. i, 142), *diuerts* for "divert"[11] (I. iii, 8), *O yes* for "Oyes"[15] (IV. v, 143), *Cal.* for *"Cre."*[16] (V. ii, 13), and *whom some euer* for "whomsoever"[17] (II. i, 69). Note especially that in V. v, 11, both Q and F read, incorrectly, *Epistropus, Cedus,* and *Polixines,* and in the next line *Thous.*

Compared with the atrociously senseless punctuation of Q, the punctuation of F is a marvel of accuracy and elegance. Notwithstanding this, there are in F instances of bad punctuation which are identical with those in Q and which point to a common origin (unless we assume that F was printed from Q). Among the significant of the Folio's bad spots are the following:

"Courtiers as free, as debonnaire; vnarm'd,
As bending Angels: that's their Fame, in peace:" (I. iii, 234-235)

"And thou shalt hunt a Lyon that will flye
With his face backward, in humaine gentlenesse:
Welcome to Troy;" (IV. i, 19-21)[18]

"but what ere, know this,
In the extremity of great and little:
Valour and pride excell themselves in *Hector;*" (IV. v, 77-79)[19]

"Why then for *Venus* sake, giue me a kisse:
When *Hellen* is a maide againe, and his—" (IV. v, 49-50)[20]

"Well, welcom, welcome: I haue seen the time. (IV. v, 210)[21]

"a plague breake thy necke . . . for frighting me:" (V. iv, 35)[22]

[8]Conjecture of Hanmer's, and very plausible.
[9]Conjecture by the present writer.
[10]Conjecture by Thirlby; generally accepted.
[11]Correction by Rowe.
[12]A highly probable conjecture by Mr. Craig, adopted by Deighton.
[13]The reading of the fourth Folio.
[14]Conjecture by Pope; need for change doubtful (W. W. Greg).
[15]Correction by Collier(?).
[16]Corrected in the second Folio.
[17]Corrected by the third Folio.
[18]Line 20 requires a period after "backward" and a comma after "gentlenesse".
[19]Line 77 requires a colon after "this," and line 78 a comma after "little". Note that "what ere" (="what e'er") is common to Q and F.
[20]Line 49 requires a comma after "kisse," and line 50 a period instead of the dash.
[21]The line should end with a dash.
[22]No punctuation is required after "necke".

"I would laugh at that miracle—" (IV. iv, 38)[23]

"Let me be priuiledg'd by my place and message,
To be a speaker free?" (IV. iv, 131)[24]

"Leaue: and you take leaue till to morrow morning." (III. ii, 151)[25]

"*Troy.* She was not sure.
Ulis. Most sure she was." (V. ii, 122)[26]

"The bull has the game: ware hornes ho?" (V. vii, 12)[27]

"Has not so much wit." (II. i, 84)[28]

"Will you set your wit to a Fooles." (II. i, 93)[29]
"Fie for Godly shame?" (II. ii, 32)[30]

"Why this hath not a fingers dignity:" (I. iii, 204)[31]

Later on we shall quote even more striking and significant examples of bad punctuation in F. See pages 143-144.

F, like Q, not infrequently errs in the matter of verse-lining, in printing prose as verse and verse as prose. In a surprisingly large number of instances this occurs in identical passages in the two texts.

The following is a list of lines divided improperly in both Q and F: I. ii, 15-16, 130; I. iii, 124 (printed as two lines), 225-226, 386-387; II. ii, 9-10; III. iii, 93-94, 142-144, 148-150, 170-171; IV. i, 48-49; IV. ii, 15-16; IV. iv, 93-94; IV. v, 70-71, 75-76, 113-114; and V. ii, 41-42, 42-43, 100-101, 170-172. A total of 40 lines.

Lines of verse printed as prose in Q and F are the following: I. ii, 299-301; II. iii, 202-203, 211-212, 242-243; III. i, 6-7, 109-110; III. ii, 123-125; IV. ii, 29-30; IV. iv, 15-19; IV. v, 20-23, 38-39; V. i, 84-85; V. ii, 14-15, 98-99; and V. v, 41-42. A total of 35 lines.

Prose lines printed as verse both in Q and F are the following: III. i, 69-72; III. ii, 78-79; and IV. ii, 27-28.

---

[23]A semicolon should replace the dash.

[24]A period or a semicolon should replace the question mark.

[25]The colon should be replaced by an exclamation mark and the period by a dash. The printer of Q had an over-abundance of colons and evidently his compositor had difficulty in distinguishing between the author's question mark and exclamation mark.

[26]Commas are required after "not" and after the second "sure." Modern editions give none after "sure," but as regards punctuation modern editions are even worse than as regards text.

[27]Question marks are often indistinguishable from exclamation marks in Elizabethan manuscripts.

[28]Should be printed thus: "has not so much wit—", inasmuch as the words do not constitute a sentence.

[29]Both in Q and F periods often replace question marks. This must be due to the printer.

[30]No dramatic punctuation theory can possibly justify this question mark.

[31]A comma is required after "Why" to prevent misunderstanding.

In three instances Q and F are in agreement also in the matter of assigning speeches to the wrong person. These are the assignment of Nestor's "He's not yet through warm" (II. iii, 231) to Ajax; Achilles' lines about Hector (IV. v, 73-75) to Agamemnon (though this speech should probably be divided between Achilles and Agamemnon); and one of Cressida's lines (V. ii, 13) to Calchas. (Modern editors since Theobald are practically unanimous, wrongly, I think, in giving one of Diomedes' lines ["Nay, do not snatch it from me," V. ii, 77], despite of agreement in Q and F, to Cressida.)

Both Q and F want the following stage-directions: *Exit Boy* (I. ii, 299), *Ajax beats Thersites* (II. i, 43, 57, 82), *Within* (II. ii, 299), *Exit Thersites* (II. iii, 82), *Exit Patroclus* (II. iii, 90), *Ajax takes Agamemnon aside* (II. iii, 96), *Exit Patroclus* (II. iii, 146), *Aside* (II. iii, 169, 209, 210, 218, 220, 222, 225, 228, 229, 231), *Pandarus sings* (III. i, 118), *Exit Pandarus* (III. i, 154), *Exit Boy* (III. ii, 6), *Exit Pandarus* (III. ii, 63), *Exeunt Agamemnon and Nestor* (III. iii, 61), *Exit Menelaus* (III. iii, 63), *Exit Ulysses* (III. iii, 216), *Exeunt Achilles and Patroclus* (III. iii, 316), *Exit Thersites* (III. iii, 320), *Knocking within* (IV. ii, 40), *Enter Aeneas* (IV, ii, 45), *Exit Troilus* (IV. iii, 9), *Exit Pandarus* (IV. iv, 54), *Exeunt Troilus, Cressida, and Diomedes* (IV. iv, 139), *Trumpet sounds* (IV. v, 11), *Enter Diomedes with Cressida* (IV. v, 16), *Exeunt Diomedes and Cressida* (IV. v, 53), *Trumpet within* (IV. v, 63), *Enter Diomedes* (IV. v, 87), *Ajax and Hector enter the lists* (IV. v, 93), *Hector and Ajax fight* (IV. v, 112), *Exeunt Agamemnon and Menelaus* (V. i, 87), *Ulysses, aside to Troilus* (V. i, 93), *Exit Diomedes; Ulysses and Troilus following* (V. i, 95), *Within* (V. ii, 2, 4), *Enter Thersites* (V. ii, 4), *Whispers* (V. ii, 7), *Exeunt Priam and Hector severally* (V. iii, 94), *Troilus tears the letter* (V. iii, 110), *Exeunt Troilus and Diomedes, fighting* (V. iv, 28), *Exit Hector* (V. iv, 33), *Exit Servant* (V. v, 5), *Exeunt Troilus, Diomedes, and Ajax, fighting* (V. vi, 11, F=*Exit Troylus*), *Exit one in armor*[32] (V. vi, 27), *Hector puts off his helmet and lays his sword and shield aside* (V. viii, 4), *Hector slain* (V. viii, 10), *Achilles sheathes his sword* (V. viii, 20), *Shouts within* (V. ix, head) and *Exeunt Aeneas and Trojan Forces* (V. x, 31).

Even though F's stage-directions are much more numerous and more explicit than Q's, it is astonishing to find them in agreement in a large number of wrong stage-directions and in the omission of certain necessary stage-directions.

Wrong stage-directions which are common to both Q and F are the following: the entrance of Calchas with the Greeks at II. iii, 82 (modern editors all omit him); the too early entry of the Greeks after line 74 in Q, (after line 72 in F[33]); the omission of Ajax's name from the list of those entering at the opening of III. iii (Q omits Menelaus too); *Exit* for *Exeunt* [*Diomedes and Calchas*] (III. iii, 37); *Exeunt* for *Exit*[34] (III. iii, 69);

[32]Mr. Deighton omits this.

[33]It may be noted here that throughout most of the play the Folio text announces the entry of the *dramatis personae* one or two or more lines ahead of their actual appearance on the stage or their participation in the action. This suggests a playhouse copy.

[34]This may have resulted from the dramatist's habit of writing *Ex* or *Ext* both for *Exit* and *Exeunt*.

Exeunt for *Exeunt Troilus and Cressida* (IV. ii, 42); *Exeunt* for *Exeunt all but Troilus and Ulysses* (IV. v, 276); the omission of Menelaus from the list of those entering at V. i, 74, though he speaks line 82 (Q omits also Hector and Troilus); *Exeunt* for *Exeunt all but Thersites* (V. i, 96), *Exit* (V. v, 44); *Exit* for *Exeunt*[34] (V. vii, 8); and *Enter Aeneas, Paris, Antenor, and Deiphobus* for *Enter Aeneas and Trojan Forces* (at V. x, head).[35]

Unquestionably, then, there is some very intimate connection between the two early texts of *Troilus and Cressida.* Whether this means, as Mr. Alexander and Mr. Chambers contend, that the printers of F printed from a corrected copy of Q, or, as Mr. Pollard, after the old "Cambridge" editors, believed, that F was not printed from Q, we shall discuss after we have given the Folio text the consideration it requires. Not impossibly, we shall discover after such a study that the problem is neither so simple nor so clean-cut as these scholars have thought it. The solution to the problem may prove to be very different from the answers which have been hitherto offered. But we must not anticipate.

If correctness of verse-lining were a certain criterion of the holographic character of a printed play, we would be compelled to say that F, like Q, was not printed from the author's manuscript; although it might be argued that the printer may have disturbed the verse-lining because he wished to save space, or because he could not distinguish prose from verse in a manuscript in which, in accordance with a common custom, lines of verse did not begin with a majuscule. But the matter is even more complicated than this implies. We know that some poets (*e.g.,* Thomas Middleton, making a clean copy of his *A Game at Chesse,* a manuscript now preserved at Trinity College and reprinted by Professor Bald, Cambridge, The University Press, 1929) departed from their normal verse-lining by running words from one line on to the next line, and that they even copied as prose passages of verse. If Shakspere did this, and there is no reason for assuming that he did not, the occasional mislining of short passages in his printed texts would prove nothing. And it is undoubtedly significant in this connection that in both Q and F the improperly divided passages are almost always only one and a half lines long and only very rarely (twice, I think) four lines long. Verse passages printed as prose, and prose passages printed as verse, do not exceed three lines in modern editions.

[35]That so many of these are in the fifth act is surely significant.

In addition to the wrongly-lined passages which F and Q have in common (see page 129), F divides the following lines improperly: I. i, 112 (two lines); I. ii, 12 (two lines); I. iii, 33 (two lines), 47 (two lines), 51 (two lines), 248 (two lines); II. ii, 51-52 ("Brother . . . worth/ What . . . holding." Prose in Q.); IV. iv, 69-70 (two lines); IV. iv, 71 (two lines); V. vi, 4 (two lines); V. vi, 6 (two lines); V. vi, 27 (two lines). It is surely odd that in eleven of the twelve mislinings which it does not share with Q it is only a matter of printing one line of verse as two. The point is of significance, for it can hardly be imagined that a compositor would have departed needlessly from the correct lining of the Quarto in these passages. And an editor, having access to Shakspere's own manuscript (or to an official copy) would not have marked these passages for incorrect "correction."

F prints as prose only two verse passages in addition to those previously listed, namely, II. iii, 214-215 and IV. v, 208-210. It can hardly be doubted that the latter was due to the large number of letters in the line, "Ha! By this white beard, I'ld fight with thee tomorrow!" (forty-six letters instead of the average thirty-eight).

Besides the passages previously listed (page 129) in which Q and F print prose as verse, F does this also to the following passages: I. i, 34-35, I. ii, 64, 70-71, 113-114, 138-139, 179-180, 181-182; II. iii, 109 ("Here comes Pandarus"), III. i, 139-140, 144-145, 149-150; III. ii, 40. Obviously, these misdivisions cannot have been derived from Q. There is no conceivable reason why the Folio editor should purposely have departed from Q for the worse. F was, therefore, not printed from Q. It must, therefore, have been printed either from an earlier and now lost edition of the play (a license for printing was issued in 1603, six years before the publication of Q), or from the poet's manuscript, or from the playhouse copy, or from a transcript of the original.

The following statistical comments may have some value in connection with the subject we are discussing. In twenty-nine passages in which such an edition as that of Mr. Deighton does not adopt the Quarto's division of the lines (including verse for prose and prose for verse), the Folio text is correct, *i.e.*, Q differs from F for the worse, in twenty-six short passages. Of these I. iii, 356-65 and III. iii, 125-127, require comment. The former, a speech by Ulysses, makes perfectly good Shaksperian verse in Q and comes just after a cut of three lines in that text (I. iii, 353-355)—lines which are wholly unnecessary and obscure. It is evident, too, that line 355 ("Directive

by the limbs," deleted in Q) and line 356 ("Give pardon to my speech") originally made a complete verse. Combining these facts, we must come to the conclusion that Q represents the original version of these speeches and F the revised version. Shakspere was not satisfied—how could he have been?—with the words,

> let vs like Marchants
> First shew foule wares, and thinke perchance theile sell;
> If not; the luster of the better shall exceed,
> By shewing the worse first:

Here, then, we have a chance to see the poet in his workshop. At the same time we find evidence that F—at any rate, as far as this scene is concerned—represents a later version of the play than Q.

Lines III. iii, 125-127, also constituting part of a speech by Ulysses, offer an interesting problem. The lines were evidently revised. In F line 125 is only a half-line and is metrical; in Q line 125 ("Th'vnknowne Aiax, heauens what a man is there?") is full and unmetrical. Considering that in Q line 127 ("Nature what things there are.") consists of only three feet, whereas in F it consists of six feet, and that both in Q and in F we have a period after the word "are," only one conclusion seems possible: these lines are a marginal substitution for matter which the poet marked for deletion from his original version of the speech. Ulysses' speeches evidently concerned him a great deal and he worked on them with more than ordinary care.

But let us return to our statistics. Twenty-five wrongly divided passages (including verse-for-prose and prose-for-verse) are peculiar to the Folio text. These are I. i, 34-35, 112; I. ii, 12, 63-64, 70-71, 113-114, 138-139, 179-180, 181-182; I. iii, 33, 47, 51; II. ii, 109, 111-113, 214-215; III. i, 140, 144-145, 149-150; III. ii, 40; IV. iv, 70, 71; V. vi, 4, 6, 27. By Mr. Deighton's standard, forty-six passages are wrongly divided in both Q and F. Of these forty-six there are five which, in the present writer's opinion, may (and should) be left as they are in the original editions. These are II. iii, 242-243, III. i, 6-7 and 109-110, as well as V. ii, 98-99 and 100-101. It may as well also be pointed out that there are two passages (III. iii, 142-144, 148-150) in Q and F which agree with each other in the matter of line division but which, rightly, are not acceptable to modern editors. They evidently represent revised after-thoughts.

From what we have already said (page 130) about missing and incorrect stage-directions common to Q and F, it must be apparent that F, like Q, could

not have been printed from a playhouse copy which had served as a prompt-book. But the case for this view is even stronger than the facts already mentioned indicate. In addition to those listed, F lacks two other stage-directions, besides getting many others wrong. Those it wants are *Exeunt Agamemnon and Menelaus* at V. i, 87, and *Exit,* at V. ii, 193,—both, it will be noted, in the fifth act. (See note 35.) Otherwise it has every stage-direction (even though not always worded exactly the same way) which Q has.

Wrong stage-directions in F which appear correctly or not at all in Q are the following: *The Trumpets sound* for *Trumpet sounds* (I. iii, 258); *Exit* for *Exeunt*[36] II. i, 140; *Enter Pandarus and Cressida* (IV. ii, 76; Pandarus has not left the stage and Cressida enters four lines later); *Enter Aeneas* (IV. iv, 48; he speaks the next line and line 98 *"within"*); *Exit Cressida* (IV. iv, 101); *Enter the Greekes* (IV. iv, 108; modern editors correctly read, *Enter Aeneas, Paris, Antenor, Deiphobus, and Diomedes.* F's stage-direction is "most" mystifying); *Exeunt* (IV. v, 63—a surprising stage-direction); *Enter Agamemnon and the rest* (IV. v, 158,—probably an error for *Agamemnon and other Grecian Princes enter the Lists*); *Exit* for *Exeunt Achilles and Patroclus* (V. i, 51); *Exeunt* for *Exit Thersites* (V. i, 109); *Exit Troilus* for *Exeunt Troilus, Ajax, and Diomedes, fighting* (V. vi, 11); *Soldier* for *Soldier, within* (V. ix, 2); *Exeunt* for *Exeunt all but Pandarus* (V. x, 34), and *Exeunt* for *Exit Pandarus* (V. x, 58). It should be noted, again, that almost half of these are in the fifth act. Needless to say, these cannot have been derived from Q. They come from an imperfect and confusing manuscript. With equal certainty it may be asserted that they cannot come from a prompt-copy which had been used in a theatre.

How greatly F differs from Q, and how much nearer it comes to a playhouse copy, will appear from the fact that it supplies a very large number of stage-directions which do not appear in Q and improves upon a number which do. Those it supplies are the following: *Enter Pandarus* (I. ii, 40); *Enter Common Soldiers and pass over* (I. ii, 259); *Exit Pandarus* (I. ii, 306); *Sennet* (I. iii,, head); *Tucket* (I. iii, 212); *Enter Aeneas* (I. iii, 213); *"Manet, Ulysses, and Nestor"* (I. iii, 308); *Ajax strikes Thersites* (II. i, 12); *Enter Achilles and Patroclus* (II. i, 59); *Enter Patroclus* (II. iii, 26); *Exit Achilles* (II. iii, 76); *Enter Patroclus* (II. iii, 110); *Exit Ulysses* (II. iii, 148); *Enter*

[36]Modern editors change F's *Exit* to *Exeunt,* but to the present writer (see THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN, April 1932, p. 73) F's stage-direction is right and should stand. We should have *Exeunt Achilles and Patroclus* after line 139.

a Servant (III. i, head): *Musicke sounds within* (III. i, head; modern editors transfer to line 17); *Enter Troilus* (III. ii, 4); *Exit Pandarus* (III. ii, 16); *Enter Pandarus* (III. ii, 16); *Enter Pandarus* (III. ii, 28); *Exit Pandarus* (III. ii, 34); *Enter Pandarus* (III. ii, 108); *Enter Menelaus*[37] (III. ii, head); *Flourish* (III. iii, head; omitted by some modern editors); *Enter Aeneas, with a Torch-bearer* (IV. i, head; F= *"a Torch;"* modern editors = *"a Servant with a torch"*); *Exit Paris* (IV. i, 50); *Enter Pandarus* (IV. ii, 22); *One knocks* [*within*][38] (IV. ii, 34); *Enter Troilus* (IV. ii, 60); *Exeunt* (IV. ii, 114); *Sound Trumpet* (IV. iv, 138); *Enter Achilles* (V. i, 77); *Enter Troylus and Ulysses* (V. ii, 4; but omits *Thersites*); *Exit Cassandra* (V. iii, 90); *Alarums* (V. iv, head); *Enter Diomedes, Troilus following* (V. iv, 21); *Enter Hector* (V. vi, 11). In this regard F does not improve much on Q in the fifth act.

From a careful scrutiny of the above it appears that though, as a rule, F greatly improves on the stage-directions of Q, even supplying most of the directions for what may be called "music," it now and then is decidedly bad and sometimes worse than Q.

One or two of F's stage-directions deserve a few lines of comment. *"Enter Cassandra with her haire about her eares"* is not an improvement on Q's *"Enter Cassandra rauing"* (II. ii, 100). And it is certainly wrong to have her enter after line 96 and not to indicate that she speaks lines 97 and 99 *"within."* Line 98 proves that she did not enter at line 96. The notice of her entrance is, therefore, only a warning to the actor to be ready.

F says, at III. iii, 37, *"Enter* Achilles *and* Patroclus *in their Tent," i.e.,* in accordance with the jargon of the Elizabethan theatre, they appear (are seen as if) in their tent. But it is evident from the dialogue that Achilles and his "sweet" are standing outside the entrance to the tent. Q reads, "Achilles *and* Patro *stand in their tent",* which seems to be nearer to an author's manuscript than to a playhouse copy.

It is at least curious that in IV. ii both Q and F say *"One knocks"* at the first knocking, and that afterwards both say (twice) *"knock."* So, too, Q has *"Sound trumpet"* (at I. iii, 258) where F has *"The trumpets sound."* An Elizabethan author or a prompter, apparently, wrote his stage-directions either in the imperative or in the indicative. Such indicia, therefore, furnish no clue to the source of the printer's "copy."

[37] F omits *Menelaus,* Q omits both *Menelaus* and *Ajax.*
[38] Probably only a typographical error.

We may recall that Q assigned a number of speeches incorrectly, and that in a few instances it omitted to designate the speaker. F is guilty of the same errors, but, strange to say, only very few times do Q and F make the same mistake. The Folio's errors are these: *Troilus* for *Pandarus* (I. i, 86); the words "He's not yet through warm" are continued to Ajax (II. iii, 231); "Ay, my good son" is assigned to Ulysses instead of to Nestor (II. iii, 264); Paris' line, "Sweet, above thought I love thee!' is unassigned but printed separately[38] (III. i, 166); Cressida's question, "When shall we see again?" is assigned to Troilus[39] (IV. iv, 57); and Achilles' speech (IV. v, 73-75) is assigned to Agamemnon (as in Q). This, added to what has preceded, surely warrants the opinion that, contrary to what has hitherto been thought by scholars, F, like Q, is not a careful, accurate, and authentic text.

That F was not printed from Q is supported by the following facts:

(a) A difference in III. i in the designation of the equivocating young fellow whom Q always calls *"Man"* and whom F invariably calls *"Servant."* This is the more significant because in I. ii F, like Q, repeatedly designates Alexander (Cressida's "man") as *"Man."* Perhaps F meant thus to distinguish the two young gentlemen; but, if so, it departs from this rule when it designates Troilus's "man" as "Man" in III. ii (as Q also does). F assigns V. v, 5, to *"Ser."* but Q assigns it to *"Man."*

(b) At V. viii, 16, Q assigns a speech to *"One"*; F improves this by assigning the line to *"Gree."*, that is, to a Greek, one of Achilles' Myrmidons. Modern editors assign it to *"Myr."*

(c) The name of Deiphobus (pronounced *De-if'-o-bus*) is treated very curiously in F. Including the text and stage-directions, his name appears seven times in the play. In Q it is spelled *"Deiphobus"* five times, "Diephobus" once (V. x, head), and contracted to *"Deiph."* once (IV. i, 1); F spells the name *"Deiphoebus"* three times (III. i, 141; IV. ii, 64; V. x, head); *"Diephoebus"* once (IV. i, head), contracted to *"Dieph."* once (IV. i, 1); *"Deiphebus"* once (IV. iii, head); and *"Doephobus"* once (I. ii, 244),—but *"Deiphobus"* not even once. At IV. iv, 144, F abbreviates the name to *"Dio."* possibly an error for "Diomedes."[40] Whether Chaucer's calling this man

[39]Q assigns V. x, 2-3 to Troilus, but F continues line 2 to *Aeneas* and gives line 3 to *Troilus*. In Q Troilus enters after line 1, in F after line 2. From these facts it seems warrantable to infer that here we have evidence of revision. Inasmuch as line 2 ("Never go home; here starve we out the night!") is more in keeping with Aeneas's line 1 ("Stand, ho! yet are we masters of the field."), I have the feeling that F has the better arrangement and gives us Shakspere's maturer and better-considered work.

[40]The line is omitted from Q.

"Deiphebus" and treating the name as trisyllabic had something to do with this, it is impossible to affirm but it is likely.

More convincing evidence of F's independence of Q could hardly be thought of. But this point about the orthography of the name "Deiphobus" (corresponding to Caxton's "Deyphebus") is of even greater significance than this: it shows that the scribe who made the "copy" from which F was printed was not the man who made the "copy" for Q. He had greater difficulty than his predecessor in distinguishing his author's *e*'s from his *i*'s and *o*'s—a common difficulty in Elizabethan manuscripts written in Gothic ("secretary") script. That he had other difficulties in reading his manuscript will appear as we go on.

(d) Another significant point in this connection is the use of quotation marks before certain apothegmatical sentences. Q has quotation marks before the following verses: "Things won are done; joy's soul lies in the doing" (I. ii, 312); "Men prize the thing ungain'd more than it is" (I. ii, 314); "Achievement is command; ungain'd, beseech" (I. ii, 318); and "Mind sway'd by eyes are full of turpitude" (V. ii, 108)—all from the mouth of Cressida. In F only one of these, the third, has the signpost quotation marks. Neither editor nor compositor would have departed from Q in this matter had Q been their "copy."

(e) Near the end of the first scene of the play (at I. i, 95) Q has *"Exit"* immediately after Pandarus's speech ("Pray you . . . and end"), but F alters this to *"Exit Pand."* This is a change no editor would have thought it necessary to make and which no compositor would have ventured to make.

An indication that F's "copy" was in a different handwriting from Q's may also be found in the fact that the words italicised in F are not always the words italicised in Q, and the reverse. Note, for example, that Q prints *for so tis I must confesse* (I. ii, 98) in italics; not so F; this is also true of the line *Betweene whose endless iarre Iustice recides* (I. iii, 117); the words *chaos* (I. iii, 125), *though Appollo knowes/ Tis dry enough* (I. iii, 327-328), *indexes* (I. iii, 342), *Coblofe* (II. i, 40), *Clatpoles* (II. i, 126), *Compter* (II. ii, 28), *Mercury . . . Ioue* (II. ii, 45), *Troyans* (II. ii, 96, 108 and 197),[41] ***Ioue*** **(II. ii, 127),** ***Morrall Philosophie*** (II. ii, 167), *Sparta's* (II. ii, 183), *Amen* (II. iii, 25 and 39), *Troy* (II. iii, 268), *Iupiter* (IV. v, 191), *Mars* (IV. v, 198), *maior* (V. i, 48), *Whetstone* (V. ii, 71), *Luxury* (V. ii, 51), *Diomed* (V. ii, 28), *Colossus* (V. v, 9), and *Tytan* (V. x, 25). Seeing that there is no consistency in this matter, either in Q or in F, it would be unreasonable to attribute the differences to editing. To one who has studied Ralph Crane's transcripts of *A Game at Chesse* (one at the Bodleian Library

[41]But in lines 99 and 101 both Q and F have "Troyans," without italics.

and one at the British Museum) and has noted how difficult, if not impossible, it is at times to say with certainty whether a particular word is to be regarded as being in the italic script or in "secretary," it seems reasonable to assume that not only was F not printed from Q, but that the handwriting of F's "copy" differed from that of Q.

As having a possible bearing on this question, we may also call attention to the fact that the "heroine's" name in the Quarto edition of this play is spelled *Cresseida* on the rejected titlepage of 1609, *Cresseid* on the substitute titlepage, *Cresseida* in the running titles, but that in the text and stage-directions we have *Cressid* (twenty-three times), *Cresseid* (ten times), *Cresseida* (seven times), *Cressida* (only thrice), and *Cressed* (twice). In the Folio the title and running titles have *Cressida,* whereas in the text and stage-directions the name appears as *Cressid* (thirty-seven times), *Cressida* (twelve times) and *Cressed* (once). This would suggest that Q's was not an authorized text. The point is of interest also because Chaucer calls his heroine *Criseyde* and (rarely) *Criseyda*—which may possibly have influenced the Q scribe or the compositor.

A study of the passages found in F and not in Q and of those found in Q but not in F presents some interesting problems. It is fairly certain that Q omitted certain passages (II. iii, 61-66, 96; III. iv, 77; IV. v, 206; V. ii, 64; V. iii, 58; V. x, 21-22;) accidentally.[42] As to these F certainly gives us the better text. On the other hand, there can be but little doubt that in some instances Q has omitted (and F retained) passages which Shakspere had deleted. These passages are I. iii, 314, 353-355; II. iii, 80-82; IV. v, 94, and V. iii, 20-22. F's retention of these passages means that the scribe who prepared what subsequently became Heminge and Condell's "copy" preserved matter which had been marked for deletion by the author, and probably marked in a way which the copyist did not understand.

Necessarily, Q could not include passages which formed no part of the original play and which were added after the scribe had made what became Bonian and Walley's "copy." These passages were I. iii, 70-74;[42a] III. iii, 161-163;[43] IV. iv, 144-148;[44] and IV. v, 165-170.[45] At the close of V. iii, F

[42]See page 61 in the April BULLETIN.

[42a]The lines are such a good introduction to Thersites that we cannot think them an omission intended by Shakspere.

[43]Line 160 is incomplete; up to line 160 and after line 163 our attention is focused on what "they" do, but in the intervening lines Achilles is the subject. The change in viewpoint, combined with an incomplete verse, points to revision.

[44]These lines are surely a subsequent addition, as may be inferred from the fact that both Q and F have an unnecessary *Exeunt* after line 143 and none at the end of the scene.

[45]See page 62 in the April BULLETIN.

accidentally retains three lines, part of the dialogue between the wretched Troilus and the puzzled Pandarus, which the poet had marked for deletion when he (not a tamperer) decided to transfer the lines to the end of the play, either to give the play a comedy ending or because the actor who played Pandarus could be relied on for a more effective close than the impersonator of Troilus. F's *Exeunt* after V. x, 34, if it be not a copyist's or printer's error for *Exit,* seems to warrant the inference that Pandarus's closing speech (lines 35-52) represents a still later revision.

F's omission of the words "there he unarms him" (I. ii, 298) is probably accidental; the sentence seems to be required by the words (line 300), "I doubt [=think] he be hurt." But II. i, 31-32; III. i, 91 ("I'll lay my life,"); IV. v, 94 ("They are oppos'd already"), and V. i, 22-26 ("raw eyes . . . tetter") were probably deleted by Shakspere after the "copy" for Q had been prepared. Why, it is not easy to say. Other accidental omissions in F are III. iii, 105-106, and IV. v, 29.

One omission, common to Q and F, deserves special discussion. Pandarus invites the glowing Troilus and the wily Cressida into a chamber and then goes on to say (III. ii, 222-224), "which bed, because [=that] it shall not speak of your pretty encounters, press it to death," though he had not said a word about a bed previously. Hanmer, followed by almost all modern editors, inserted the absolutely necessary words "with a bed" after "chamber" (line 222). Mr. Alexander argues from this omission that F must have been printed from Q; but, in view of all our evidence on the relations between Q and F, the correct explanation is probably that both Q and F were based on a manuscript in which the author had accidentally omitted or deleted the words. We all sometimes delete more than we intend when making corrections.

A much more difficult problem centers around line IV. v, 96. In Q, and probably in all modern editions, the line, disregarding differences of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization, stands thus:

"The youngest son of *Priam,* a true knight;"

F, on the contrary reads:

> "The youngest Sonne of *Priam;*
> A true Knight; they call him *Troylus;*"

The words "They call him Troilus" occur in all texts, including F, in line 108. The lines in F are, from a metrical viewpoint, so bad that they cannot be the result of revision. Neither can they represent original composition. Had Shakspere at this point written "they call him Troylus" he would not have deliberately repeated the words twelve lines later. Sir Edmund Chambers offers the explanation (*op. cit.,* p. 440) that Shakespeare originally wrote the words "They call him Troilus" as part of line 96, then decided to reserve them for a point later in the speech, replacing them by 'a true knight,' and made a mark of deletion, which the printer failed to observe. But this does not explain why "A true Knight, they call him *Troylus*" are printed as a separate line. What happened is, therefore, more likely to have been this: Shakspere wrote "the youngest Sonne of Priam, they call him Troylus". Then, deciding to reserve the last four words for subsequent use, he wrote "a true Knight" above and to the right of "Priam," forgetting to strike out "they call him Troylus." The copyist, not a very thoughtful or competent scribe, finding "the youngest Sonne of Priam, a true Knight, they call him Troylus" too much for one line, divided the words up as they stand in the Folio. We know that there was considerable revision in the manuscript at this point.

Q, therefore, represents an earlier version of the play. It retains a small number of passages which Shakspere had already marked for deletion (*e.g.,* II. iii, 42), as well as others (*e.g.,* III. i, 91) which he deleted at a later time, and it wants passages which were added subsequently (*e.g.,* III. iii, 161-163). F, on the other hand, is a later version of the play; it too accidentally retains some early deletions (*e.g.,* I. iii, 353-355), is augmented by several additions (*e.g.,* IV. v, 164-170), and wants certain lines which were omitted accidentally either in the copying or the printing (*e.g.,* III. iii, 105-106).

Where, it may now be asked, did the bad stage-directions come from? Surely not from Shakspere. Whence then? Evidently from two different manuscripts, neither in the handwriting of the author, neither authoritative, one subsequent to the other, and both marked with stage-directions by persons not thoroughly familiar with the play. In other words, it is fairly clear that what happened was something like this: Shakspere's manuscript (A), in a crude state, disfigured with deletions, alterations, and additions, was copied by a scribe (B) who added some stage-directions of his own; subsequently Shakspere revised his manuscript (A), and then another scribe (C) made

another copy, adding his own stage-directions and making his own mistakes. B's transcript became Bonian and Walley's "copy" in 1609, C's became Heminge and Condell's "copy" in 1623.[46] Shakspere's original manuscript or the licensed prompt-copy had probably gone the way of his other manuscripts, most likely in the fire which destroyed the Globe Theatre in 1613. If we assume that Bonian and Walley refused to permit Q to be used as "copy" by the Folio publishers, and that Heminge and Condell had difficulty for a time in finding a private owner of a transcript of the play, but found one after they had gone to press, we may have the explanation for some of the bibliographic phenomena characterizing this play in the Folio.[47]

Scribe C, like his predecessor, made many blunders, some easily correctible, some not, when he transcribed Shakspere's manuscript. Most of his textual errors were probably due to mere carelessness and thoughtlessness while working on something in which he had no great personal interest—he was probably engaged in this drudgery only to earn a little money. But a large number of his mistakes—an unusually large number—must be credited to difficulties in reading the manuscript.

As in Q, we find in F a number of superfluous words. These are "is" (I. ii, 125, "Is he is"); "him" (I. ii, 207, "see him him nod"); "at" (I. ii, 286, "I lye at,"); "and" (I. iii, 190, "and keepes his Tent"); "in" (I. iii, 353, "Limbes are in his instruments,"); "Ulysses" (I. iii, 386), "there" (II. i, 9, "Then there"); "a" (II. iii, 41, "wast thou in a prayer?"); "and" (II. iii, 127, "Yea, and like faire Fruit"); "beyond" (II. iii, 250, "beyond beyond"); "may" (II. iii, 273, "may saile swift,"); "as" (III. ii, 204, "as Winde,"); "and" (III. ii, 226, "and Pander,"); "it" (III. iii, 112, "straine it"); "the" (III. iii, 168, "the welcome"); "ayrie" (III. iii, 226, "ayrie ayre.");[48] "his" (III. iii, 274, "his demands"); "in" (IV. i, 9, "in a whole weeke"); "a" (IV. v, 55, "a language"); "that" (V. i, 102, "that it is prodigious,"); "his" (V. i, 108, "his tent"); "a" (V. ii, 22, "you are a forsworne.—");[49] "not" (V. ii, 27, "Bid me doo not any thing"); and "Why," (V. ii, 42, "Why, how now Lord?")[50] A total of twenty-four, exactly twise as many as in Q. Most

[46]That an Elizabethan play might exist in the form of different transcripts, some even containing alterations in the author's hand, is proved by the five extant manuscripts of *A Game at Chesse*, no two of which agree.

[47]See J. Q. Adams's *A Life of William Shakespeare*, 1922, page 522.

[48]For a highly fantastic attempt to justify the Folio reading, see Mr. C. D. Stewart's *Some Textual Difficulties in Shakespeare*, 1914, pages 14-19.

[49]C evidently thought the sentence unfinished; Q lacks the dash. C's error of putting a period before a dash indicative of interruption finds a parallel in Mr. Deighton's edition at III. ii, 152.

[50]Q's "How now, my lord!" is preferable to F's text.

of these may be due to the copyist rather than to the compositor. From this list we have omitted III. iii, 43, with its superfluous "why turn'd" (after "are bent") because Q has the same reading. At the end of lines III. iii, 1, and V. ii, 32, F has the extra-metrical word "you," the omission of which in Q must probably be attributed to carelessness.

Mistakes are almost inevitable in the preparation of a transcript of any considerable length. Among such expected mistakes none is more certain than the omission of occasional words, no matter how necessary they may be to the text. In Q, we may recall, we noted fifty-four omissions from the text, not counting lines and half lines. F also has omissions of single words, and these may now be listed: "tell" (I. ii, 199); "there's" (I. ii, 220, "there's laying on,"); "see" (I. ii, 233); "peace" (II. i, 122); "Neapolitan" (II. iii, 22); "Come" (II. iii, 45), "you" (II. iii, 94); "great" (II. iii, 266); th'[51] (III. i, 155); "own" (IV. iii, 9); "they" (IV. v, 69, Q="shall they be"); "have" (IV. v, 263); "the" (V. i, 20, "the guts-griping"); "no!" (V. i, 32); "all" (V. ii, 39); "but"[52] (V. ii, 157); "all" (V. iii, 5); "Ha!" (V. vi, 13); "next" (V. viii, 11); and "and" (V. viii, 13). A total of nineteen, about one-third as many as in Q. C, it seems, was much more likely to insert unnecessary words than B, and also much less likely to omit necessary ones. But we must not forget that some of these errors are probably the work of the compositors, and that compositors are much more likely to omit words than to insert any.

The transposition of words occurs only six times in F, viz.: "is it" (I. iii, 127); "so say" (II. iii, 90); "I do so" (II. i, 67); "a Cuckold and a Whore" (II. iii, 78-79); "thus with us" (II. iii, 242, Q="with us thus"); "you not" (III. i, 36, Q="not you"); and "not till now" (III. ii, 130, Q="till now not").

Previous commentators have all been struck by the fact that F's punctuation is much "heavier," *i.e.,* much more abundant, and more in accordance with the requirements of common sense, logic, and grammar, than Q's. This, they thought, was due to the labors of Heminge and Condell's mythical editor. The greater likelihood, however, is that it represents the work of scribe C, a somewhat more intelligent and sensible transcriber than B. For

[51]Inasmuch as Shakspere wrote "for th' love" (V. iii, 44), there is no reason for not reading "from th' field" here.

[52]Deighton reads, without comment, "but half attach'd"; Q and F omit "but". Should we not read "e'en half attach'd"?

all that, the punctuation in F is sometimes thoroughly absurd and no less chaotic than B's. In addition to the examples of bad punctuation which we have previously quoted we shall list the following passages:

"O that her Hand
(In whose comparison, all whites are Inke)
Writing their owne reproach;" (I. i, 57-59)

"Her bed is *India,* there she lies, a Pearle,
Between our Ilium, and where she recides
Let it be cald the wild and wandring flood," (I. i, 107-109)

" 'Tis just, to each of them he is himselfe." (I. ii, 74)

"So, he has." (I. ii, 105)

"If he do, the rich shall have, more." (I. ii, 210)

"Can *Hellenus* fight Vncle?" (I. ii, 238)

"*Hellenus* no: yes heele fight indifferent, well, I maruell where *Troylus* is;" (I. ii, 239-240)

" 'Tis *Nestor* right. Now play him (me) *Patroclus,* Arming to answer in a night-Alarme," (I. iii, 170-171)

"*Hector,* what say you too't." (II. ii, 7)

"what lost in the Labyrinth of thy furie?" (II. iii, 1-2)

"The amitie that wisedome knits, not folly may easily vntie." (II. iii, 108-109)

"I my good Sonne." (II. iii, 264)

"Sweete Lord whose a field to day?" (III. i, 140)

"but I was won my Lord
With the first glance; that euer pardon me,
If I confesse much you will play the tyrant:" (III. ii, 127-129)

Oft haue you (often haue you, thankes therefore)
Desir'd my *Cressid* in right great exchange." (III. iii, 20-21)

"they were vs'd to bend
To send their smiles before them to *Achilles*:" (III. iii, 71-72)

"for men like butter-flies,
Shew not their mealie wings, but to the Summer:" (III. iii, 78-79)

"now shall we see to morrow,
An act that very chance doth throw vpon him?
Ajax renown'd?" (III. iii, 130-132)

"While pride is feasting in his wantonnesse
To see these Grecian Lords;" (III. iii, 137-138)

"A woman impudent and mannish growne,
Is not more loth'd, then an effeminate man,
In time of action:" (III. iii, 218-220)

"Fare you well withall my heart." (III. iii, 304)

"This is the most,despightful'st gentle greeting;
The noblest hateful loue, that ere I heard of." (IV. i, 30-33)

"The griefe is fine, full perfect that I taste," (IV. iv, 3)

"Here, here, here, he comes, a sweet ducke." (IV. iv, 11)

"Ile take that winter from your lips faire Lady
Achilles bids you welcome." (IV. v, 24-25)

"Why begge then?"[53] (IV. v, 48)

"Why then for *Venus* sake, giue me a kisse:
When *Hellen* is a maide againe, and his . . . (IV. v, 49-50)

"Here is sir, *Diomed*: goe gentle Knight,
Stand by our *Ajax*:" (IV. v, 88)
"His blowes are wel dispos'd there *Ajax*." (IV. v, 115)
"Why my negation hath no taste of madnesse?" (V. ii, 123)

Many, many more examples might have been quoted, but the above are probably sufficient to show that C did not always understand what he was copying, that he often misconceived his author's meaning, that he did not copy from Q, that he did not have a corrected Q for his "copy," and that his punctuation cannot represent the author's intentions.

Except for the occasional trick of printing one verse as two, the Folio text is prosodically somewhat better than Q. It omits only four of the necessary elisions and contractions we find in that text, but, on the other hand, it introduces seven or eight which are not to be found there.[54] The difference is too slight to constitute a difficulty in the acceptance of the theory that Q and F were derived from a common source; on the contrary, it tends to confirm it.

[*To be concluded.*]

[53]For "Why, beg then!"

[54]Those which it fails to reproduce are the following: "suffrance" (*vs.* "sufferance" I. i, 30), "th' applause" (I. iii, 59), "gor'd" (*vs.* "gored," III. iii, 229), "sigh'st" (*vs.* "sighest," IV. iv, 16), and "theeu'ry" (*vs.* "theeverie," IV. iv, 43). Peculiar to F are the following: "conqu'ring" (I. iii, 351), "answer'd" (III. iii, 35), "oppos'd" (III. iii, 107), "th' applause" (III. iii, 119), "th' uncomprehensive" (III. iii, 199), "deceiv'd" (IV. ii, 40), "there's" (IV. iv, 64), "plagu'd" (V. ii, 101), "mean'st" (V. iii, 29). F also corrects two of Q's erroneous elisions: "the" for "th' " in II. iii, 177 and III. iii, 125. The balance, I need hardly say, is in favor of F.

Dramatic Reminders

By GEORGE F. REYNOLDS

MODESTY is hardly a characteristic trait of our age, but even we still hesitate to make some claims. One of these timidities concerns the Elizabethan audience. Recognizing the continuing supremacy of Shakespeare, most of us quite illogically go on to think of his audience as sharing in his greatness. For them *Hamlet* and *Othello* and *Lear* were first written; at least they first heard these plays; "what men or gods are these!" But it was the inane *Mucedorus* which they carried into the most editions, a fact to give us at least some courage. Admitting that they did surpass us at many points, we may, I think, urge one advantage, at least, on our side—that we do not require to be told so much outright, that we can and do infer with quicker and surer understanding.

Proof of this is to be found in a striking difference between Elizabethan and modern drama, but one not as yet, so far as I know, much called attention to. Hamlet, contemplating suicide, soliloquizes about it for thirty lines; in Philip Barry's *To-morrow and To-morrow* a similar idea is suggested merely by taking up a lighted candle to blow it out. And this dependence on implication is typical of contemporary methods; the dialogue of this play—not markedly unusual among modern plays in this respect—proceeds, in contrast to the downrightness of the Elizabethans, more by suggestion than by direct statement. To exhibit this difference in the dialogue would require a rather lengthy analysis of typical plays of both periods, but a similar conclusion can more briefly be established by noticing what—awkwardly, I admit,—I am calling Dramatic Reminders. These are devices also worth attention for their intrinsic importance, for they are of very frequent occurrence in modern drama.

An illustration chosen for clarity rather than finesse will make definition easier. In *Sun-up,* at the end of act II, after Rufe's old mother has let him go off to war without kissing him good-bye or giving any verbal sign of emotion, the playwright secures a powerful effect by having her stand in the doorway straining her eyes after him and stroking the handle of his hoe, which he has left leaning against the wall. This emotional connotation having been established, the same business is used to bring the play to an appealing conclusion. There, without any explanatory words, it reminds the audience of this association, which they must recollect if the final situation is to signify what it should.

A "property" so employed is a dramatic reminder. A phrase, a song, a gesture may be similarly used. All are dramatic reminders if, with little or no explanation, they bring back to the mind of the audience associations previously established in the play, and so heighten the significance of a later situation. They are, for the play in which they occur, symbols like those of more general significance, such as the cross or the flag, which are of course frequently used in a similar way for dramatic purposes, but which require no special preparation.

Examples of dramatic reminders occur in many sorts of plays. To avoid long explanations I cite only familiar instances. Dickinson's commonly read *Chief Contemporary Dramatists,* first series, in its twenty plays, supplies some obvious cases. An interesting study is to notice how these reminders are in the course of the play given their special significance, but I shall take space to point this out only for Moody's *The Great Divide,* all the clearer because rather melodramatic. In act I Ruth is bought by Ghent's chain of gold nuggets; in act II she bitterly returns them to him after her long struggle to buy them back. Thus at the end of the play her action in placing them again about her neck has with little comment a climactic effect of real power. Other examples may be listed merely with the situation in which they become useful: Lady Windermere's fan when Lady Windermere lets it fall at Mrs. Erlynne's entrance at the ball, act II; the stockings with dropped stitches in *Riders to the Sea,* which prove Michael's death; the cat's-eye pin in *The Witching Hour,* which provokes Clay to murder; Michael's mother's picture in *Michael and his Lost Angel,* which at the beginning of act III he takes down and places with its face against the wall; the hour-glass in Yeats' play of that name; and the pipe of Lord Ravensbene in *The Scarecrow,* which he breaks at the end of the play. The Weavers' song in *The Weavers* and the sound of a breaking string at the end of *The Cherry Orchard,* though unlike these others in not being material objects, still are used like them as dramatic reminders. Then there are the symbolic cherry orchard itself, and Melisande's ring, though her doves and the red robe of Brieux's play are perhaps more in the nature of general symbols than dramatic reminders in their special plays. For phrases used as dramatic reminders we may turn to such examples as Ibsen's "the banner of the ideal" in *The Pillars of Society,* "the compact majority" and "local situation" of *An Enemy of the People,* Hilda's "thrilling" in *The Master Builder,* Hedda Gabler's "vine leaves in his hair". Mention of Ibsen also suggests his frequent use as dramatic reminders of such unseen symbols as the white horses of *Rosmersholm* and Hedwig's wild duck. An excellent example of the more usual sort of dramatic reminder is Dr. Rank's card of farewell in *The Doll's House.* And so instances could be multiplied of uses by modern dramatists of this device which depends upon the ability of the audience to recollect the special significance of some object, phrase, or gesture.

The difficulty met by these reminders is one peculiarly of the dramatist whose convictions do not allow him to address his audience directly. When a novelist wishes similarly to remind his readers of something they should remember, he can do so in so many words. Thus, to take an in no way remarkable instance, Hardy in *The Woodlanders,* chapter XLII, wishing to make us surely aware of the meaning of this episode, says, comparing Grace's nursing of her lover, Giles, to Mrs. Charmond's nursing of Grace's husband Fitzpiers: "Six months before this date a scene, almost similar in its mechanical parts, had been enacted at Hintock House. It was between a pair of persons most intimately connected in their lives with these. Outwardly like as it had been, it

was yet infinite in spiritual difference, though a woman's devotion had been common to both."

The Greek dramatist, because of the chorus, could employ almost as direct methods as the novelist to remind the audience of what it needed for comprehending an important situation. Sophocles, for example, does so in the chorus on the birth of Oedipus in *Oedipus Tyrannus,* and Euripides similarly introduces direct allusions to the fall of Troy in the first long chorus of *The Trojan Women.* With the conventions in which they worked they did not need to tax their audiences' powers of inference.

The practice of the Elizabethans is perhaps, therefore, more significant. They were, it is true, free to acknowledge the presence of the audience, as in soliloquies and asides, but they also realized the greater effectiveness of what can be seen as well as talked about. They, in consequence, used material objects of dramatic significance quite freely, but usually these are of so very obvious meaning or are accompanied by so much explanatory comment as scarcely to come within the field of our definition. In Shakespeare's plays, for instance, the audience did not need to be very adept at inference to catch the significance of Henry VI's bier as an accessory at Richard of Gloucester's wooing of Anne, or of Macbeth's severed head as a demonstration of Malcolm's triumph. The ghosts which appear to Richard III before his defeat are nearer to the sort of device I am illustrating, as are also Caesar's, which confronts Brutus before Philippi, and Banquo's in the procession of apparitions in *Macbeth.* Caesar's cloak is used dramatically, surely, but Antony does not leave its significance to inference. The novice's costume of Isabella in *Measure for Measure* is effective theatrically, but more from its general associations than any given it especially in this play. So much is said whenever they occur about Othello's handkerchief, the chain in *The Comedy of Errors,* the ring and the letter in *Twelfth Night,* the caskets and the rings in *The Merchant of Venice,* the flower Love-in-Idleness in *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* the poisoned cup and sword in *Hamlet,* that the audience had little chance to exercise any powers of inference it may have had. Perhaps as good an example as any from Shakespeare's plays of a dramatic reminder which does make some demands upon the audience occurs in *Julius Caesar,* where Cassius, committing suicide, does so by using the same sword with which he killed Caesar. To be sure, he has to say in so many words that it is the same, because one sword looks so much like another, but neither can a modern dramatist depend upon such undistinctive objects without explanation. So Rostand, in *Cyrano de Bergerac,* though occupied through much of the fourth act in arranging that the farewell letter be wet with Cyrano's tears and Christian's blood, in his fifth act finds it necessary to remind us of the circumstances again in very carefully planned speeches.

The other Elizabethans offer little that differs from Shakespeare. In contrast to the eight or more clear examples of dramatic reminders from

Dickinson's series of twenty plays, I can find no good illustration in the thirty of Neilson's collection. Marlowe in *Edward II* seems about to offer two in the handkerchief Edward sends to his queen (V, i, 118) and the ring she sends to him (V, iii, 72) but neither is again referred to. The shoe by which Ralph finds Jane in *The Shoemaker's Holiday,* is re-introduced without any comment (IV, iv), but unless Elizabethan shoes were much more distinctive than modern ones, it could hardly have been recognized by the audience until much later in the scene, when Ralph himself tells about it. Not much inference is necessary to make clear the significance of the box without a pardon for Pedringano in *The Spanish Tragedy,* the taper as a test of chastity in *The Faithful Shepherdess,* the oracle in *The Broken Heart,* or even Jeremy's remark in *The Alchemist* about Subtle and the supposedly departed Face, "I thought 'em honest as myself, sir". The best example known to me from Elizabethan drama of a line depending upon inference for its significance is the last speech of the Fool in *Lear,* interpreted as a forecast of his own death: "And I'll go to bed at noon." But this may be only a modern reading of it, and in any case takes us into the much larger field of inference in the dialogue. In general, in Elizabethan plays the significance of every situation is carefully explained at the moment in so many words.

To emphasize how much the moderns use it and to show the different form dramatic reminders may take, I cite a few examples from fairly recent plays. Milne in *Ariadne or Business First* underlines his idea by having John extravagantly turn on all the lights at the end of the play in contrast to his carefully turning them out in the first act. In *The Twelve Pound Look* it is Lady Sims's simple inquiry as to the price of typewriters which points the conclusion. John Ferguson in the stress of his troubles pushes away the Bible he has so often resorted to, but when the worst has fallen draws it to him again. The momentary dimming of the lights in *The Last Mile* makes the electrocution horribly real. *Charles and Mary,* the English play on the Lambs, comes to an effective end with a simple repeated song, and *The Barrets of Wimpole Street* closes with a reference to Elizabeth's dog. In all these cases there is little or no comment, the author trusting entirely—and successfully—to his audience's powers of recollection of significances already established. And of course the films, especially the silent pictures, have had to make a great deal of use of dramatic reminders. One illustration from innumerable examples, and an especially effective one, is the rose in the hero's buttonhole in Chaplin's *City Lights.* We owe at least some of our skill in interpreting dramatic reminders to the education the movies have given us.

And so one might continue indefinitely to cite modern examples. But the fact must be sufficiently established that in comparison to the Elizabethans, contemporary dramatists make a great deal more use of dramatic reminders and in consequence depend more largely upon their audiences' powers of inference. This is worth noting for itself, but has it any further significance? One hesitates to draw too sweeping conclusions, especially without more

careful consideration of the history of inference in drama, to note in what circumstances it began to be common. That, however, would require more space than is here at my disposal. Inference must have been difficult in the noise and distractions which the Elizabethan and Restoration dramatists had to contend with, and in the large and dimly lighted theaters of the eighteenth century. It is assisted by the use of distinctive properties and scenery, and it is, of course, peculiarly suited to our prevailing realistic technic, which finds place only with difficulty for long explanations and comments. But allowing for all this, may we not recognize a difference in the audiences themselves? Modern playwrights use dramatic reminders and in other ways depend upon inference because they can. They can because we, their audience, have become trained to it. We seem, in this one respect at least, to be a more skilled audience than our ancestors.

May we go further and claim that this has made possible an advance in the drama itself? Curiously enough Mr. William Archer, whose purpose in *The Old Drama and the New* was to show such progress, says nothing of this greater use of inference. He discusses instead how the "pure drama", as he calls it, of imitation has progressed by freeing itself from the lyrical drama of passion. We are not so sure as he was, I think, that this growth in realism is a positive advance or merely a change in conventions; it may even be an impoverishment. But the greater use of inference is rather different. It allows a subtlety of effect, a richness of overtones, an economy of means to ends, a swiftness of movement that has produced a difference in the texture of the dialogue, in the quality of the pleasure derived from drama, almost in the very stuff of the drama itself. Yet even here too there may be some loss. The eloquence and poetry with which the Elizabethans embroidered their great situations must—it is almost absurd to say—be heard; it cannot be inferred. Some modern theatergoers, indeed, seem quite unable to enjoy it even when they do hear it. But be the audience whatever it may, certainly the gesture of blowing out a candle hardly gives an equivalent pleasure to Hamlet's "To be or not to be".

Lord Cobham and Shakespeare's Duchess of Gloucester

By MARION A. TAYLOR

IN a recent article, I advanced arguments for believing that the puritanic Lord Cobham, who was probably instrumental in having the name of Sir John Oldcastle changed to Sir John Falstaff, was likewise responsible for suppressing the stories of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and his duchess, Eleanor, in several editions of the *Mirror for Magistrates.*[1] The two stories, telling the misfortunes of the unlovely Cobham ancestress, seem to have been published in the 1578 edition of the *Mirror,* when the Elizabethan Lord Cobham was in temporary disfavor with the Queen. I shall now attempt to prove that Lord Cobham's objection to the portrait of Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester, involved not only the *Mirror* but also certain plays and poems of the 1590's and early 1600's, among them Shakespeare's *II Henry VI.*

Although the popularity of the *Mirror* suffered an eclipse in the 1590's, we see again in the *Contention* the good Duke Humphrey and his over-ambitious wife. She exhibits a shrewish disposition in her quarrels with proud Queen Margaret.[2] Like Lady Macbeth, she attempts to incite her husband to seize the throne.

> Why are thine eyes fix'd to the sullen earth,
> Gazing on that which seems to dim thy sight?
> What seest thou there? King Henry's diadem
> Enchas'd with all the honours of the world?
> If so, gaze on, and grovel on thy face,
> Until thy head be circled with the same.
> Put forth thy hand, reach at the glorious gold.
> What! Is't too short? I'll lengthen it with mine;
> And, having both together heav'd it up,
> We'll both together lift our heads to heaven,
> And never more abase our sight so low
> As to vouchsafe one glance unto the ground.[3]

Here, too, are depicted the witch scene, the denunciation of Lady Eleanor, her penance, and her shameful exile, as in the *Mirror.* Unlike the metrical narrative, however, the dramatic story of Humphrey and Eleanor does not show signs of suppression. A comparison of the 1594 quarto of the *Contention* with the folio version of *II Henry VI* shows that while there may have been lines

---

[1] "Lord Cobham and the *Mirror for Magistrates*", *Shakespeare Association Bulletin,* July-October, 1933, 154 ff.

[2] *Cf. II Henry VI,* I, iii, 138 ff. For convenience I have cited references from *II Henry VI,* but all portions referred to appear in the *Contention.*

[3] I, ii, 5 ff. See also I, iii, 35 ff.

omitted and speeches transposed, the stories of the Duke and his wife remain essentially the same.[4]

Why were these Cobham ancestors allowed to pursue their dramatic way unmolested during the early 1590's? If Lord Cobham did take offence at the notoriety of his inglorious ancestress on the public stage, as he apparently did earlier with the *Mirror* and later with Falstaff, he would have been powerless for at least five reasons to take direct action. (1) Unlike the travesty of Sir John Oldcastle in the *Henry IV* plays, the portrait of Eleanor Cobham in the *Contention* was justified by history. In the event of any dispute, there were such chronicles as Grafton's, Stow's, Hall's and Holinshed's to serve as irrefutable authority. (2) *I Henry VI* introduces the Duke of Gloucester as Protector of the Realm, and the *Second Part* naturally continues his colorful story. It is inconceivable that any chronicle play dealing with the reign of Henry VI would omit two such important characters as Humphrey and his wife. (3) While a sensitive descendant might cause two stories to be removed from a group of scattered individual legends without doing serious harm to the whole, he certainly could not order two important characters to be excised from a dramatic trilogy without inflicting fatal damage. (4) If he did wish to register a complaint, he, like modern critics of the play, may not have known exactly whom to blame for the *Henry VI* plays—Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Nashe, Kyd or Shakespeare.[5] (5) Finally, even if the *Contention* did involve but one author, there is good evidence for believing that the play was alternately owned by no less than three dramatic companies within a short space of time: Henslowe's and Alleyn's, Pembroke's, and the Chamberlain's.[6] It would have been far more difficult for Lord Cobham to register a complaint with a dramatic company sponsored by a powerful patron, than with an

---

[4] See especially H. C. Hart, *The Works of Shakespeare. the Second Part of Henry the Sixth,* Arden edition, *passim.* The various texts of *II Henry VI,* including the *Contention,* are there collated.

[5] For discussion of the authorship, see H. C. Hart, *I Henry VI, II Henry VI, III Henry VI,* introductions; E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare.* Oxford, Clarendon, 1930, I, 291 f.

[6] Under the date March 3, 1592, Henslowe in his *Diary* lists *I Henry VI* as *"ne"* (probably new) [*ibid.. I,* 247]. Greene's dying attack against Shakespeare, involving a line from *III Henry VI,* was printed by September 3, 1592 (*ibid.,* 246). Since it is unreasonable to argue that the three plays did not appear in order, we may place *II Henry VI* at least before September, 1592. It is safe, therefore, to conclude that if the plays were produced in or before 1592, they all three belonged originally to the Henslowe and Alleyn Company (*ibid..* 59). In 1595, a quarto of *II Henry VI* (known then as *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*) was printed, advertising the play "as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke his seruants" (*ibid.,* 277-8). Even though the 1594 quarto of the *Contention* mentions no dramatic company and there remains no early quarto of *I Henry VI,* we may assume that these plays were the property of the Pembroke Company. Since the trilogy appeared in the First Folio, the third owners must have been the Chamberlain's men, who probably acquired Shakespeare and these plays at the same time.

editor and an author, as must have been true of the *Mirror*. Furthermore, if he did not act in haste, he would have found himself dealing with companies who possessed the play second- or third-hand and who, in all likelihood, would seek to shift the blame for objectionable material. But it seems that the Cobhams retaliated in another way.

Let us first review activities of the two important London theatrical companies in the 1590's, and possible Cobham connection. From August 8, 1596, until his death in March, 1597, William Brooke, seventh Lord Cobham, was Lord Chamberlain and therefore patron of the Shakespeare company.[7] Sometime during this period, this company rechristened Sir John Oldcastle, obviously because the offended Lord Cobham could object that the caricature was historically inaccurate. "It may not, moreover, have been mere negligence on Shakespeare's part that the original name assumed in the *Merry Wives* by the jealous Ford was Brooke", later changed to "Broome".[8] Cobham's son, Henry, the eighth lord, seems to have inherited his father's eagerness to keep the family name untarnished, but not the position of Lord Chamberlain. Indeed, there are reasons for believing that he was identified with the Lord Admiral's company rather than with the Chamberlain's, after his father's death. Shortly after 1597 (the date is uncertain) Cobham married the widowed Countess of Kildare, daughter of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, and Lord Admiral.[9] Cobham's sister, Elizabeth, was the wife of Sir Robert Cecil, who numbered both Howard and Cobham among his staunch friends.[10] Furthermore, the Admiral's company presented two plays complimentary to the Cobhams.

Sometime between November 1 and 18, 1599, they produced the first part of *The True and Honorable History of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham,* a play which makes every effort to reestablish the Cobham ancestor as a martyr who suffered for the Protestant religion, which came into its own during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In 1600 the Chamberlain's company issued the second quarto of the *Contention,* a play by that time some eight years

---

[7] *Ibid.*, I, 383.

[8] J. L. Hotson, *Shakespeare versus Shallow,* quoted in T. S. Baldwin, "Shakespeare and Shallow", *The Times Literary Supplement,* October 8, 1931, 778.

[9] Sidney L. Lee, "Henry Brooke, eighth Lord Cobham", DNB.

[10] Upon the death of the elder Cobham, the disposal of the important Cinque Ports position became a subject for many suits, chiefly that of Essex for Sir Robert Sydney, and Cecil for the young Yord Cobham. Cecil and his brother-in-law triumphed, however, for on August 20, 1597, "the Lord Cobham was installed Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports" (John Chamberlain, *Letters,* Camden Society, 1861, 18). Two days after Essex's hasty return from Ireland, September 29, 1599, Cobham, Raleigh and Nottingham were among the guests at a dinner given by Sir Robert Cecil (Thomas Birch, *Memoirs,* London, 1754, II, 433-4).

old, but which reappeared so soon after *Sir John Oldcastle* that it cannot seem pointless in the light of Cobham controversy.[11]

Let us now scrutinize an obscure Admiral's play of the same year which juggles the facts of history and presents the Duchess of Gloucester in a distinctly favorable light. The story of the first and only extant part of Day and Chettle's *The Blind-Beggar of Bednal-Green* (presented May 26, 1600)[12] involves so thin a romance as to be almost negligible, but, by laying the scene in the reign of Henry VI, the authors manage to graft the story of Duke Humphrey onto the plot. Here he is younger and gayer than the Duke of the *Mirror* and the *Contention.* Although early in the play, he and Cardinal Beauford are constantly bickering over old rights and both are made to vie for the hand of Lady Eleanor, it is Gloucester who is most generous in the reconciliation. King Henry VI, who has made elaborate preparations for the marriage between Duke Humphrey and Lady Eleanor at court, begs that

---

[11] The whole controversy probably involves more than a personal grudge. Scholars have shown that the stage, often used as a political tool during the ages of Elizabeth and James, was a platform of opinion in the last years of old Queen's reign, and the year 1600 was particularly t[illegible]. (See *Hamlet,* III, ii, 20 f.; Virginia C. Gildersleeve, *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama, passim:* T. S. Graves, "The Political Use of the Stage During the Reign of [illegible]", *Anglia,* 1914, XXXVIII, 137-156; R. B. Sharpe, "We Band of Brothers", *Studies in Philosophy,* April, 1929, XXVI, 166-176). The Earl of Essex had on September 28, 1599, hastily returned from Ireland against the orders of the Queens and was virtually a prisoner to the Crown for the next six months. In March, 1600, he was removed to his own house, where he was guarded by two keepers, and it was not until the following August that he was given full liberty. His disfavor at court still continued, however, and his house became a rendezvous for discontented men, seething with rebellion. (See Laura H. Cadwallader, *The Career of the Earl of Essex,* Philadelphia, 1923, 58, 68, 70, 74). In the meantime, Essex's enemies, the Cecil party, sought his ruin. If men expressed themselves politically in 1600, it was likely to be in terms of the Essex or the Cecil party.

We have just seen that Cobham was firmly entrenched in the Cecil party. Essex, complaining of the lack of support at home, wrote the Queen from Ireland on June 25, 1599:

> . . . is it not believed by the rebels, that those, whom you favor most, do more hate me out of faction, than them out of duty and conscience? Is it not lamended of your majesty's faithfullest subjects bothe there and here, that a *Cobham* or a *Raleigh* . . . should have such credit and favour with your majesty, when they wish the ill-success of your majesty's most important action, the decay of your greatest strength, and the destruction of your faithful servants? (Birch, *op. cit.,* II, 418).

One of the chief battle cries of Essex during his rebellion was that Raleigh and Cobham were plotting his life (S. L. Lee, "Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex", DNB, and *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts,* 1601-1603, London, Longmans, 1870, 35-38).

In the late 1590's, there were but two important, rival companies in London, and the plays seem to mirror these two factions. When great honours were expected of him in Ireland, Essex was openly eulogized in *Henry V* of the Chamberlain's company (see Chorus, V, 30-35). Between November 1-18, 1599, after the unfortunate Earl has hastily returned from Ireland and the Queen was trying to decide what to do with this strong-willed noble, the Admiral's company found it expedient to produce in all haste the play which flattered an arch-enemy of Essex. Soon after, the second quarto of the *Contention,* without much doubt now belonging to the Chamberlain's company, revived the notoriety of the disagreeable Cobham ancestress.

[12] In W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary,* I, 121, we find posted:

> "Receaued of Mr. Henshlowe the 26th of May 1600 in behalfe of the Company to pay H. Chettle & Jhon Day in full payment of a booke Called the blynd begger of bednall greene the some of vli xs."

the quarrel between Humphrey and Beaufort be effaced. Humphrey quickly replies:

> *Gloster* speaks first, yet speaks he not in fear
> As begging *Bewford's* friendship, but in love
> Both to his King and to fair England's good.
> Yet ere I set my hand to this new League,
> Bewford, if any undigested wrong
> Lyes in thy swelling bosom, freely speak 't,
> And *Gloster* will as freely answer it;
> But if thy Conscience be as clear from soyl
> Of hateful treachery as Gloster's is,
> Give me thy hand and with thy hand thy heart,
> Which Gloster will as charily regard
> As the best blood that's chamber'd in his breast.[13]

The Lady Eleanor of this play attracts our attention. She has been unhistorically transformed into a pitiful, fair, young noblewoman, preyed upon by a villainous guardian, Playnsey, whose unwelcome advances she checks with maidenly virtue. She is continually trying to effect peace between the Cardinal and Humphrey. Although she is designated simply as Lady Eleanor, we may infer that she was intended as Eleanor Cobham because of her first name and the fact that she marries Humphrey.[14] Furthermore, the King addresses her as "Ant Ellanor" after her marriage to his uncle.[15] This appears to be, then, a decided effort on the part of the Admiral's Company to "whitewash" the character of Eleanor Cobham.

> . . . I'll keep Ellenor;
> And wed her in St. Johnses, make her my Dutches.
> *Ibid.*, 15.

Meantime the Gloucesters were being celebrated in a fairly important non-dramatic work of the period. The year of the *Blind-Beggar's* appearance (1600), Christopher Middleton wrote his *Legend of Humphrey, Duke of Glocester* after the manner of the *Mirror for Magistrates,* but with a difference in subject matter. Whereas in the latter Humphrey fell because he was blind to the fickleness of fortune, and his wife lost her prestige through overweening pride and ambition, in Middleton's poem the duke and his wife are portrayed as the innocent victims of jealous enemies. There is high praise for Humphrey at the beginning:

> O were my penne but able to set downe
> Great Gloster's vertues (as indeed they were);
> How would the world, bewitch'd with his renowne,
> In immitation strive for to come neere
> His worthy deedes; whereof who were possest,
> Themselves might justly thinke were haply blest.[16]

[13] W. Bang, *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas,* Louvain, 1902, I, 63.
[14] Humphrey says,
[15] *Ibid.*, 63.
[16] *Harleian Miscellany,* London, 1813, X, 168.

Cardinal Beaufort is pictured as solely responsible for the feud between himself and Gloucester.

> Yet, Glocester, thou wert guiltlesse of that wrong,
> Thou stoodst for thy defence, he strove t'offend;
> Medled with nothing but what did belong
> Unto thy office; whilst he did contend
> To keep downe the young King, to displace thee
> And bring this land to servile villany.[17]

Gloucester declares before the King his innocence in the quarrel.

> With that speaks reverend Gloster, whose gray hayres,
> The auncient signes of honour, did presage
> A guiltlesse soule, in humble words declares
> What he suppos'd incens'd the Bishop's rage.
> And how himself had patiently out-borne
> His injuries, disdainfull words and scorne.[18]

Eleanor Cobham is pictured throughout as a guiltless character.

> But more than to his friend they accuse his wife;
> A vertuous lady, one of good account;
> Layes treasons to her charge, seeks for her life,
> Sayes, her conspiracies doe farre surmount
> The common faults of men, and she hath been
> A traytor unto God, and to the King.
>
> They charge her that she did maintaine and feede
> Soul-killing witches, and convers'd with devils;
> Had conference with spirits, who should succeede
> The King; and, by their names has wrought some evill
> Against his royall person; and had sought
> To end his life, and bring the stage to noght.
>
> Upon surmises thus she was arraygn'd,
> Witness suborn'd, and she condemn'd for it;
> And from her husband closely is detain'd;
> And that their doings might succeed, more fit
> To their desires, it is 'mongst them thought meete,
> She should doe open pennance in the streete;
>
> And after that perform'd, be banished thence
> Into the Isle of Man; and there should live
> A guiltlesse exile, for a small offence
> Or none at all; and who so ere did give
> That unjust sentence, hath ere this his doome
> Amongst th' condemn'd, where comfort nere shall come.[19]

[17] *Ibid.*, 172.
[18] *Ibid.*, 174.
[19] *Ibid.*, 177.

Humphrey intercedes for his wife, pleading that her charges are unmerited.

> Against my wife (God knowes a guiltlesse soule)
> Is past, a heavy judgement undeserv'd,
> Which yet thy royall power may controule,
> And by that meanes their lives may be preserv'd
> That live to doe thee good; who, were they gone,
> I prophecie thy quiet raigne were done.[20]

The King, however, avers that he is powerless to help, and Eleanor suffers punishment. Later, through the machinations of his enemies, Gloucester himself meets a harsh, undeserved fate. Surely Middleton's efforts to flatter the Gloucesters, particularly Eleanor, seem to have been as zealous as those of the authors of the *Blind-Beggar*.[21]

The scheming Eleanor Cobham, then, may have embroiled herself in Elizabethan affairs. Stories revealing her misdemeanours written for the *Mirror for Magistrates* were suppressed for nineteen years and printed the year Lord Cobham was involved in an ill-fated diplomatic mission to the Low Countries. The Chamberlain's company revived her evil career in a second quarto of the *Contention* in 1600, after the Oldcastle-Falstaff controversy. On May 26, 1600, the Admiral's company took liberties with history and presented Eleanor as an innocent young girl. Furthermore, Christopher Middleton, an author prominent in London, eulogized her in his long poem on Humphrey. It would seem that the Elizabethan Lord Cobham took offence at the evil career of the Duchess of the *Mirror* and the *Contention,* and that such works as the *Blind-Beggar of Bednal-Green* and the *Legend of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester* were efforts to cater to the haughty lord's ancestral pride. If so, that unwitting noble doubly linked himself with immortality. He may be remembered for his connection not only with Falstaff, the great rogue of literature, but also with the beautiful, wicked Duchess of Gloucester.

---

[20] *Ibid.,* 179.

[21] What significance, if any, may be attached to Eleanor Cobham's letter to Humphrey in M. Drayton's *Heroicall Epistles,* first published in 1597? While the portraits of Eleanor and Humphrey are here historically accurate, they seem to me to be softened by a sympathetic attitude on the part of the author. Drayton's associations, considered in the light of possible Cobham controversy, are not entirely clear. The possibility of his being one of the authors of *II* and *III Henry VI* has already been discussed (cf. Dr. Else von Schaubert, *Drayton's Anteil an "Heinrich VI". 2 u. 3. Teil,* Cöthen, 1920). By 1599, Drayton was aiding Wilson, Hathway and Munday in the composition of the *First Part of John Oldcastle.* Furthermore in 1600, he wrote a commendatory verse for Middleton's *Legend of Duke Humphrey* (A. H. Bullen, "Michael Drayton" DNB). Had he come to sympathize with a group loyal to the Cobhams?

Editorial Notes

By S. A. T.

Our readers will undoubtedly wonder why the frontispiece in this issue of the BULLETIN reproduces the scene from *Troilus and Cressida* which constituted the frontispiece in the April issue. But if they will examine the two illustrations they will note a remarkable improvement and some interesting changes in the illustration published by J. Tonson in his edition of the play in 1734. Such alterations occur, we think, in the illustrations in all of the Tonson 1734-35 publications of Shakespeare's plays. Can someone of our readers explain the phenomenon? Here is, we believe, a subject for an interesting essay.

From the Treasurer's report which we print in this issue it is apparent that our Association has nothing to worry about as far as concerns finances. We have funds enough to assure the publication of the BULLETIN for the next two or three years. This, we need hardly say, is largely because of the generosity of the Carnegie Foundation. With the assistance of our new President we hope soon to be independent of outside aid.

It is to be hoped that the generosity of some wealthy American will soon create an Ashley H. Thorndike Fellowship in English Literature, not only to perpetuate the memory of our beloved former President, but to encourage that honest and zealous devotion to the scientific study of literature to which he had given so many years of his life.

It is pleasant to announce that, notwithstanding the unabated continuance of hard times, the membership of the Association is not falling off unduly. In fact, during the recent past we have made some gains in our membership. This is very encouraging in view of the fact that the dues have been raised to double what they had been. With a little effort on the part of each one of us we can have a membership of 1500 within a year. That would bring our ultimate goal—our own Shakespearian theatre, library and clubhouse in New York—so much nearer.

It is the purpose of the present editor to throw open the pages of the BULLETIN to essays dealing with any phase of Elizabethan literature, not merely such as deal with Shakespeare. The great Stratfordian cannot be separated from his contemporaries; without his predecessors he would not have been what he was, and without him his successors would not have been what they were. Dramatic history revolves around him. We therefore invite scholars, foreign as well as American, to send us the fruits of their researches in the fields of Elizabethan and Jacobean literature.

Another book which we highly recommend to students of Shakespeare, especially those who are interested in the costumes worn by Shakespeare's contemporaries — the costumes in which he imagined his creations to be clothed—is Mr. H. K. Morse's *Elizabethan Pageantry* (The

Studio Publications, New York). The book is a handsomely printed small folio, contains 82 illustrations, and a very extensive glossary of terms relating to Elizabethan dresses, and costs only $3.50.

The Tudor and Stuart Club of the Johns Hopkins University has just begun the publishing of a new magazine, *E L H, a Journal of English Literary History.* The first issue, handsomely printed on fine paper, contains interesting essays on Sir Walter Raleigh, Edmund Spenser, the Earl of Essex, and on minor English renaissance epics. From the announcement we learn that the magazine will be published three times a year at fifty cents a copy. The editors and the Club have our best wishes.

Those of our readers who have been at pains to struggle through our study of the Quarto text of *Troilus and Cressida* will not, we hope, fail to realize the significance of that study. It shows that we have been much too ready to accept Professor A. W. Pollard's classification of the Quartos published during Shakespeare's lifetime as being either "good" or "bad" Quartos, the "bad" ones being the stolen, surreptitious and unauthorized publications of pirates, and the "good" ones the authorized publications of honest men who obtained the authentic playhouse manuscript from the author or his theatrical associates. Our study shows that a Quarto might have been neither "bad" nor "good" (as Professor Pollard uses these words) but a transcript of a privately owned manuscript copy. Whether this was the case with other Quartos besides *Troilus and Cressida* remains to be seen. What we know about *The Winter's Tale* would indicate that this was the case.

A book which we are awaiting with a great deal of interest is Mr. M. H. Spielmann's *Shakespeare Treads the Boards.* In this book Mr. Spielmann, a veteran Shakespearian scholar, summarizes and criticises all the plays he has been able to find in which the incomparable William himself is one of the *dramatis personae.* The number of such plays, in English, German, French, Spanish, Italian and other languages, we are informed, exceeds ninety.

In our April issue (pages 105-106) we took occasion to comment on what we considered an important defect in Mr. J. W. Mackail's 'Life of Shakespeare' in the recently published *Companion to Shakespeare Studies,* a collection, for the most part, of rather amateurish and mediocre essays by a number of learned 'specialists' in the Elizabethan field. What little value may really be attached to Mr. Mackail's account of the poet's life, and what little benefit a 'student' may derive from the opening chapter in this 'transvaluation of critical values', should appear from these facts: (1) Mr. Mackail tells his readers (on page 4) that John Shakespeare applied for a grant of family arms in 1596, but he does not tell them that the application was granted, and he says nothing about the subsequent objections to the grant. (2) Mr. Mackail says that

the result of the subsequent application (in 1599) for leave to impale the arms of Arden "is not known," although it is absolutely certain that the application was not granted. (3) Mr. Mackail is apparently wholly unaware of the very interesting fact that in 1613 William Shakespeare collaborated with Richard Burbage in designing and painting an *impresa* for the Earl of Rutland which was to be exhibited in the great tournament (on March 24, 1613) in celebration of the King's succession.

Did space permit, we should show that the other essays in this book, with only a very small number of exceptions, are no better than Dr. Mackail's, that the writers are no better informed and that their papers are no less amateurish or of greater value to either the specialist or the general reader. We know, of course the view here presented is not the view which English reviewers—apparently all members of The London Mutual Admiration Society — will force down the throats of their gullible readers. The anonymous reviewer in the London *Times Literary Supplement,* for example, devotes (in the issue of May 24, 1934) two columns of adulation to the writers of this "admirable and friendly book". Had American scholars perpetrated this compilation the review would, we may be sure, have been very different, every misplaced or inverted comma would have been dragged out of its obscurity and made a noose on which to hang the writer.

Undoubtedly there will be some who will take exception to our frank speaking on this subject. Most scholars prefer to fume in silence at such injustices or to express their resentment behind closed doors. But there is no sense in this attitude. We see no good reason why an American scholar should have to submit to having his book, representing the work of years, praised for the excellence of its printing or the good quality of the paper, and his contribution to knowledge spat upon because of some very minute and inconsequential error of fact or defect in judgment. Let us mention in this connection, that we may not be charged with indulging in generalities, the recent review of Mr. C. B. Judge's fine work on *Elizabethan Book Pirates* (Harvard University Press) in the *Times Literary Supplement,* June 7, page 405. Isn't it time that English scholars ceased to indulge in this sort of childishness, or, shall we say, maliciousness?

Even the most jaded and most wearied reader of Shakespearian commentary will receive a delightful jolt when he reads the late Professor Oscar W. Firkins's *Selected Essays,* just published by the University of Minnesota Press (a book of 298 pages, sold for $2.50). Of the seventeen essays which make up the book, six deal almost wholly with Shakespearian subjects. The essays on 'What happened to Hamlet,' and on 'The character of Macbeth' will startle the reader with their originality and with the cleverness with which surprisingly new points are forced upon his attention. On every page of these essays it is apparent that Dr. Firkins brought to his reading of Shakespeare not only an original

mind, but the insight of the psychologist and the imagination of the artist —the two qualities most often lacking in Shakespearian commentators.

In a recent issue of the London *Times Literary Supplement* Mr. Henry Cuningham revives the old discussion regarding the use of the word 'keepes' in Othello's speech about 'the Pontick Sea, Whose icie Current, and compulsive course, Neu'r keepes retyring ebbe, but keepes due on To the Propontick.' There is no question but that the first 'keepes' cannot have been Shakespeare's word. Various emendations have been proposed. Most modern editors follow the second Quarto (1630) and read 'feels'. Now Mr. Cuningham, a veteran emendator, objecting to 'feels' as being 'extremely weak and unsuitable . . . to a strong sea current,' proposes that we read 'seekes.' He thinks that a compositor misread Shakespeare's 'seekes' as 'keepes,' inasmuch as 'there is merely the substitution of *s* for *p*' [!].

With this emendation we cannot agree. 'Keepes' is undoubtedly wrong. 'Feels' is a good emendation; a current may just as logically 'feel' (*i.e.,* know, experience) a retiring ebb as 'seek' one; 'keepes' differs from 'seekes' not in the substitution of an *s* for a *p* but in the substitution of *k* for *s* and *p* for *k*. In the 'secretary' script an *f* may be mistaken for a *k* but medial *k* cannot be mistaken for *p*. The compositor's mistake was due to mental causes, not to a visual error. 'Feels' might be misread as 'seekes' but not as 'keepes.' But if Shakespeare wrote 'feeles' why should we depart from it, and if he did not, why should we depart from a good—an excellent—reading in favor of something as obvious and commonplace as 'seekes'? The compulsiveness of the onward rush of the current is much more clearly brought out by 'feeles' than by 'seekes.'

ERRATA

Unfortunately the April issue of the BULLETIN contained a few very disconcerting printer's errors, none more so than the displacement of four lines in Professor Draper's essay on the Ghost in *Hamlet*. On page 77 of that issue, the first four lines should go to the bottom of the text-page.

On page 55 the word "is" (the first word in the third line of the text) should be "it".

On page 58 the numeral "49" (bottom line of text) should be "59".

On page 83 "covereign" (the first word in the fourteenth line from the bottom) should be "sovereign".

On page 105, in the left-hand column, a line ("works and words to prove that our") was dropped out after the sixteenth line.

Communications

Tarquin's Ravishing Slides

TO readers familiar all their lives with Pope's reading, "strides" (F *"sides"*) in *Macbeth* II, i, 55, the alternative emendation *"slides"* (sb.), defended by Dr. Tannenbaum (*Shaksperian Scraps,* p. 96) is bound to seem strange and even comic. If the defender of "slides" retorts that to speak of the strides of a ghost is equally comic, these same readers reply with evidence (in passages cited by Steevens, Warburton, and Wright) that by the Elizabethans "strides" was sometimes used of easy or leisurely or languid steps.

Nevertheless there is something to be said for *slides.* Dr. Tannenbaum points out that a manuscript *sl* is much more likely than *str* to have been misread *s.* He also assembles evidence that the verb "slide" was used to mean "glide". I should like to make a further suggestion in support of this reading.

It should be noted that the passages cited in support of "strides," though they show that strides need not be violent and swift, do not eliminate the visual suggestion of long steps. The walker is swinging along, even if languidly. Is not this, however, somewhat inappropriate in the context? Does not Milton's "Smooth sliding without step" (cited by Dr. Johnson) convey precisely, as Dr. Tannenbaum believes, the Shakespearian image? Murder is moving like a ghost. How does a ghost move?

Perhaps some light on this point is cast by a passage from that later connoisseur of spirits, Daniel Defoe. In his *Remarkable Passage of an Apparition* (1720) he has the learned and scrupulous Dr. Ruddle of Launceston in Cornwall record, among his observations of the behavior of the alleged spirit of Dorothy Dingley:

"2. That the motion of the spectrum was not gradatim, or by steps, and moving of the feet; but a kind of gliding, as children upon the ice, or a boat down a swift river, which punctually answers the descriptions the ancients gave of the motion of their *Lemures,* which was [in Greek]

kata[tina] 'rumen aérion kai ormèn aparapódiston.[1]

Heliodor[us, Bk. III, §13.]"

If "strides" were the reading of F, one might, I think, argue plausibly that "stealthy pace"[2] of the preceding line supported its correctness, in spite of

---

[1] "by a sort of aerial gliding and unhampered impulse."

[2] As a matter of fact, "stealthy pace" probably refers to "manner of walking" (Schmidt), rather than to "steps"; note the various terms coupled with "pace" by Shakspere which are descriptive of the general carriage rather than of the way of taking steps: modest, stately, slow, feeble, stealthy. "In pace another Juno" certainly suggests a stately or statuesque progression, with little or no connotation of legs. Often, too, of course, the reference is merely to rate of movement. The phrase is not necessarily in conflict, then, with the suggested reading.

the contrary implication of "moves like a ghost". But with "sides" in the text and "slides" the easiest emendation, "moves like a ghost", it seems to me, becomes a corroborative not a discordant item, especially in the light of the phenomena observed by the learned doctor of Launceston.

In *Julius Caesar* also, we remember, there were "gliding ghosts".

W. T. Hastings.

Brown University
Providence, R. I.

Shakespeare's Twin-Voice Again

THE account printed in the April BULLETIN of Thomas Hardy's devotion to Shakespeare demands supplementing in several places.

After stating (p. 93) that Hardy witnessed on August 14, 1884 an amusing performance of *Othello,* it should be noted that two years later *The Woodlanders* appeared with two quotations from *Othello.*

The biographical sketch (p. 94) indicates that Hardy's last act of Shakespearian devotion was his attendance, at the age of 82, at an outdoor performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* It should be added that four years later Hardy was still active as a student of Shakespeare. In June 1926 he read an editorial in the London *Times,* discussing the "dram of eale" passage in *Hamlet* (I, iv, 36). Although he was then 86 years old, Thomas Hardy was still zealous enough in the service of Shakespeare to write the following letter to the editor of the London *Times.* It appeared on June 17, 1926.

"Your leading article on the famous passage with which Shakespeare's printers have tantalized the poet's readers for the last 300 years reminds me that in the 1860s I worked at elucidating it and marked in the margin of a copy I used my own conjectural reading. I give it here, since it may pass in the crowd of conjectures on what Shakespeare really did write, as being not much worse than the rest:

The dram of ill
Doth all the noble substance leaven down
To his own scandal."

Hardy lived to pass only one more birthday after this attempt at textual emendation.

Among the instances given in the April BULLETIN (pp. 95-96) of Hardy's

verbal indebtedness to Shakespeare's plays, the following additions and corrections should be made:

The statement (p. 96) that Shakespeare is mentioned twice by name should be corrected to include a third instance, in *The Hand of Ethelberta,* 7.

The statement (p. 97) that *Othello* is missing must be contradicted. Further search has disclosed three marks of Hardy's acquaintance with *Othello: Romeo and Juliet:*

This play is mentioned by title in *The Hand of Ethelberta,* 7.

"It was the nightingale" (III, v, 2) is echoed in *Under the Greenwood Tree,* V, 2. *Henry V:*

Hardy's echo (April BULLETIN, p. 95) is in *Jude the Obscure,* VI, vii.

(1) Othello and "his Ancient" are mentioned in *The Hand of Ethelberta,* 7.

(2) "Not poppy nor mandragora", etc., (III, iii, 330) is quoted in *The Woodlanders,* 36.

(3) "Men are not gods" (III, iv, 148) is quoted in *The Woodlanders,* 39.

Perhaps readers of the BULLETIN have detected other quotations or echoes.

Carl J. Weber.

Colby College
Waterville, Me.

SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Treasurer's Report April 27, 1934

General Account

Receipts

Balance as of April 30, 1933		393.13
Dues and Bulletin Subscriptions		914.95
		1,308.08

Disbursements

Secretary's account	94.55	
Treasurer's account	51.12	
King John Organization	10.00	
Printing of Bulletin	307.63	463.30
Balance General Acct.		844.78

Special Account

Building Fund		100.00
Bibliography Fund		
Balance Apr. 30, 1933	758.50	
From Carnegie Corp.	1,000.00	
	1,758.50	

Disbursements

Sec. Acct.	36.76		
Printing	608.56	645.32	1,113.18
Total Balance			2,057.96